National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF THE ENGLISH AND GERMAN SUBJUNCTIVE

by

LEANNE MARIE BOYTINCK ©

A thesis

submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN GERMANIC PHILOLOGY AND LINGUISTICS

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Spring 1994

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-11162-8

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Leanne Marie Boytinck

TITLE OF THESIS: Comparative Grammar of the English and German Subjunctive

DEGREE: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Spring 1994

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

(SIGNED) Leanne Boytinck

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Box 1021

Fairview, Alberta

Canada, TOH 1LO

DATE December 21, 1993

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Comparative Grammar of the English and German Subjunctive" submitted by Leanne Marie Boytinck in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Germanic Philology and Linguistics.

R. d'Alquen

Supervisor: Dr. Richard d'Alquen

Manfred Prokop

Dr. Manfred Prokop

Dr. Gary Libben

DATE 21 December 1993

DEDICATION

For my grandparents and parents

Abstract

This comparative grammar examines the morphological means by which the subjunctive mood is expressed in both English and German, followed by a study of the uses in independent and dependent clauses.

The German subjunctive I and II inflectional system is largely distinct from the indicative mood, whereas English has experienced syncretism, almost eliminating the distinction between subjunctive and indicative verb forms in isolation. English and German are parallel in that both have the subjunctive I based on the present stem of the verb and a subjunctive II based on the past stem. English and German differ in that German has a set of endings varied according to person and number, while English has zero-endings.

The uses of the present subjunctive I and II in English and German can be divided into two semantic categories, the optative and the potential. In the optative category, the present subjunctive I functions in real wishes, goals and objectives, instructions, conditions and final clauses and the present subjunctive II is employed in unreal wishes. Under the potential category in both languages fall the uses of the present subjunctive I in conditions, concessives and after verbs of doubting and fearing. The present subjunctive I is also employed in indirect speech in German and hypothetical situations (after 'lest') in English. The present subjunctive II in both English and German is used in implied conditions, polite requests, unreal conditions, concessives, clauses of false comparison and hypothetical situations. In German, the present subjunctive II is also used in clauses expressing exceptions and unfulfilled expectations as well as in indirect speech.

The uses of the past subjunctive I and II in English and German are almost entirely parallel to those of the present subjunctive I and II, with the exception of real wishes and polite requests and statements which are logically restricted to a present subjunctive. In German, the present subjunctive II is also required in implied conditions and select unreal conditions. Unfulfilled expectations require the past subjunctive II in German.

The range of uses of the English and German subjunctive are largely similar, as is the tendency to employ the replacement form **would / würde** + ***infinitive***.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Richard d'Alquen for his guidance and belief in me and my work. I found his advice, sense of humor and never-ending encouragement during the writing of this thesis invaluable. I also thank Dr. Manfred Prokop and Dr. Gary Libben for their suggestions and constructive comments. I am truly indebted to my friend Marianne and my sister Laverne, who were constantly there for me, and Uwe, der nicht nur mein Freund sondern auch mein Vorbild ist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1

1.1. Modality versus Mood 1

1.2. Objectives of the Thesis 7

2. Forms of the Subjunctive 8

2.1. Forms of the Present Subjunctive I 8

2.1.1. English Present Subjunctive I Forms 8

2.1.1.1. Morpheme Analysis 9

2.1.2. German Present Subjunctive I Forms 10

2.1.2.1. Morpheme Analysis 12

2.1.3. Comparison 13

2.2. Forms of the Present Subjunctive II 14

2.2.1. English Present Subjunctive II Forms 14

2.2.1.1. Morpheme Analysis 17

2.2.2. German Present Subjunctive II Forms 17

2.2.2.1. Morpheme Analysis 25

2.2.3. Comparison 26

2.3. Forms of the Past Subjunctive I 28

2.3.1. English Past Subjunctive I Forms 28

2.3.2. German Past Subjunctive I Forms 28

2.3.3. Comparison 29

2.4. Forms of the Past Subjunctive II 30

2.4.1. English Past Subjunctive II Forms 30

2.4.2. German Past Subjunctive II Forms 30

2.4.3. Comparison 31

3. Uses of the Present Subjunctive I 33

3.1. Optative Subjunctive I 33
3.1.1. Independent Clauses 33
3.1.1.1. Subjunctive I in Wishes in English 34
3.1.1.2. Subjunctive I in Wishes in German 36
3.1.1.3. Comparison 39
3.1.1.4. Subjunctive I in Instructions in English 41
3.1.1.5. Subjunctive I in Instructions in German 42
3.1.1.6. Comparison 43
3.1.2. Subordinate Clauses 44
3.1.2.1. Adverb Clauses 44
3.1.2.1.1. Subjunctive I in Conditions in English 44
3.1.2.1.2. Subjunctive I in Conditions in German 45
3.1.2.1.3. Comparison 46
3.1.2.1.4. Subjunctive I in Final Clauses in English 46
3.1.2.1.5. Subjunctive I in Final Clauses in German 47
3.1.2.1.6. Comparison 48
3.1.2.2. Noun Clauses 49
3.1.2.2.1. Subjunctive I of Wishing in English 49
3.1.2.2.2. Subjunctive I of Wishing in German 50
3.1.2.2.3. Comparison 51
3.2. Potential Subjunctive I 52
3.2.1. Subordinate Clauses 52
3.2.1.1. Adverb Clauses 52
3.2.1.1.1. Subjunctive I in Conditions in English 52
3.2.1.1.2. Subjunctive I in Conditions in German 53
3.2.1.1.3. Comparison 54
3.2.1.1.4. Subjunctive I in Concessives in English 55

3.2.1.1.5. Subjunctive I in Concessives in German 56
3.2.1.1.6. Comparison 58
3.2.1.1.7. Subjunctive I in Hypothetical Situations in English 59
3.2.1.2. Noun Clauses 59
3.2.1.2.1. Subjunctive I of Fearing and Doubting in English 59
3.2.1.2.2. Subjunctive I of Fearing and Doubting in German 59
3.2.1.2.3. Comparison 60
3.2.1.2.1. Subjunctive I of Indirect Speech in German ...60
4. Uses of the Present Subjunctive II 63
4.1. Unreal Optative Subjunctive II 64
4.1.1. Independent Clauses 64
4.1.1.1. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in English 64
4.1.1.2. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in German 66
4.1.1.3. Comparison 68
4.1.2. Subordinate Clauses 70
4.1.2.1. Noun Clauses 70
4.1.2.1.1. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in English 70
4.1.2.1.2. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in German....71
4.1.2.1.3. Comparison 72
4.2. Potential Subjunctive II 73
4.2.1. Independent Clauses 74
4.2.1.1. Subjunctive II in Implied Conditions in English 74
4.2.1.2. Subjunctive II in Implied Conditions in German 74
4.2.1.3. Comparison 76

4.2.1.4. Subjunctive II in Polite Requests and Statements in English 77
4.2.1.5. Subjunctive II in Polite Requests and Statements in German 78
4.2.1.6. Comparison 81
4.2.1.7. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in English 82
4.2.1.8. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in German 82
4.2.1.9. Comparison 84
4.2.2. Subordinate Clauses 85
4.2.2.1. Adverb Clauses 85
4.2.2.1.1. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in English 85
4.2.2.1.2. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in German 88
4.2.2.1.3. Comparison 91
4.2.2.1.4. Subjunctive II in Concessives in English 93
4.2.2.1.5. Subjunctive II in Concessives in German 94
4.2.2.1.6. Comparison 98
4.2.2.1.7. Subjunctive II in Clauses of False Comparison in English 99
4.2.2.1.8. Subjunctive II in Clauses of False Comparison in German 100
4.2.2.1.9. Comparison 104
4.2.2.2. Noun Clauses 104
4.2.2.2.1. Subjunctive II in Hypothetical Situations in English 104
4.2.2.2.2. Subjunctive II in Hypothetical Situations in

German 105
4.2.2.2.3. Comparison 106
4.2.2.2.4. Subjunctive II of Exception and Unfulfilled Expectation in German 106
4.2.2.2.5. Subjunctive II of Indirect Speech in German 108
5. Uses of the Past Subjunctive I and II 110
5.1. Potential Subjunctive 110
5.1.1. Independent Clauses 110
5.1.1.1. Subjunctive II of Unfulfilled Expectations in German 110
6. Conclusion 112
6.1. Form 112
6.2. Validity of Subjunctive Category 113
6.3. Use and Prospects 117
6.4. Application 119
Bibliography 122

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Modality versus Mood

Modality in a language consists of many types of meaning that reveal an attitude of the speaker towards a topic. They may be expressed through the use of morphological or lexical means. These include adverbs ('surely'; 'probably' etc.), modal verbs (***must***; ***may*** etc.), and forms of the verb called moods, traditionally for English and German the indicative, imperative and subjunctive. These express broadly speaking fact (indicative), command (imperative) and doubt or unreality (subjunctive). This thesis will limit itself to an examination of the morphological means of the verb to express modality as in the contrast in English between third person singular *has* (pres. ind.) **have** (pres. subj. I), *is* (pres. ind.) **be** (pres. subj. I), *was* (past ind.) **were** (pres. subj. II) or in German *hat* (pres. ind.) **habe**, (pres. subj. I) *ist* (pres. ind.) **sei** (pres. subj. I), *war* (past ind.) **wäre** (pres. subj. II). In areas where the subjunctive is slowly being replaced with either a modal or other construction, the preferred alternatives will be touched upon.

Over the years many scholars and grammarians have attempted to define mood and modality in a universally acceptable way. Karl-Heinz Bausch addresses the prevailing uncertainty by stating that:

> "Modus/Modalität ist ein zentrales Problem sowohl der außereinzelsprachlichen theoretischen Linguistik als auch bei der Strukturbeschreibung von Einzelsprachen. Die Linguistik befindet sich auf diesem Gebiet noch in einer Experimentierphase."[1]

There is generally, however, a differentiation made between the two terms. Bausch continues that, "[i]n der Regel unterscheiden die Grammatiken zwischen Modus (seltener Modalität), der repräsentiert ist durch die Konjugationsparadigmata des Verbs, und Modalität (seltener Modus), die bezogen wird auf Modalverben, Modaladverbien, Modalpartikel u.ä."[2]

---

[1] Karl-Heinz Bausch, Modalität und Konjunktivgebrauch in der gesprochenen deutschen Standardsprache, vol. 1.9, Part 1, Heutiges Deutsch (München: Max Huber, 1979) 14.

[2] Bausch, Modalität und Konjunktivgebrauch 56.

For the purposes of this thesis, modality will be defined as the speaker's or writer's attitude toward the topic addressed and mood as the grammatical category of the verb in which modality is expressed.[3] Hennig Brinkmann's definition, though metaphorical, is reconcilable with this view. He defines modality as the value (Wert) that the speaker attributes to his utterance.[4] Brinkmann states that, "[d]ie Modi des Verbs geben darüber Auskunft, ob die Aussage in den gegebenen Horizont der Sprechsituation fällt oder ob sie diesen Horizont überschreitet... ."[5] Brinkmann's horizon is the boundary between fact, expressed using the indicative, and non-fact employing either the imperative or the subjunctive. Through modality we are able to reveal the attitude (value / Wert) we have toward what we are saying. With mood we make a statement about the match (or mismatch) between the world and our words.[6] What we express, whether it lie within the boundaries of our reality or not, is expressed through mood. The three moods simply give us three categories of attitude to express our thoughts regarding the topics of our utterances.

Generally, when the speaker regards the contents of the statement to be true, the indicative mood is used. When a command is given, the imperative mood is employed. If a supposition, desire, possibility, wish or exhortation is to be conveyed (all forms non-fact), the subjunctive mood may be chosen. The following are examples of the three moods in a few of their typical functions in both English and German.

---

[3] For various definitions of modality and/or mood(s) see Wladimir Admoni, Der deutsche Sprachbau (München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1970) 165-166. George O. Curme, English Grammar (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1953) 54-55. Günther Drosdowski, et al., eds., Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache, 4th ed., vol. 4, Duden (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut, 1984) 155. Karl Erich Heidolph, et al., eds., Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1981) 520-522.

[4] Hennig Brinkmann, Die deutsche Sprache. Gestalt und Leistung (Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1962) 345.

[5] Brinkmann 345.

[6] Francis James, Semantics of the English Subjunctive (Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 1986) 27.

INDICATIVE

The indicative states a fact as perceived by the speaker or writer; who wishes to express a view with certainty and to stress its validity. Thus, the use of the indicative - the most frequently used mood in both English and German - expresses the speaker's attitude of factuality or at least plausibility.

Statements of fact: E: The new student *needs*[7] a car.

G: Das Mädchen *schläft* jetzt.

Real Conditions: E: If the weather is good, I *will* ***play*** baseball.

G: Wenn es regnet, *werde* ich ein Buch ***lesen***.

Indirect speech: (expressing the speaker's belief in the factuality of the reported statement in German)

G: Günther sagt, daß Petra keine Zeit *hat*.

IMPERATIVE

The imperative is used to express a command to one or more persons. Wishes or requests, orders and instructions can be expressed in the form of a command.

Wishes/Requests: E: Come in, please!

G: Geh, ich bitte dich!

---

[7] From here on a system will be used when attention is drawn to certain verb forms: inflected verbs will be written in italics, infinitive verb forms will be bolded and italicized, command forms will be underlined and subjunctive verbs forms will be bolded.

Orders: E: Be quiet!

G: Seid still!

Instructions: E: Fold the cake batter slowly.

G: Nehmen Sie zweimal täglich eine Tablette.

SUBJUNCTIVE I

Subjunctive I, subjunctive of the possible, is divided up into two categories, the optative and the potential. The optative subjunctive I is used to express something that is wished for or desired, and the potential subjunctive I is employed when the speaker wants to convey a thought as conceivable but not factual.

Optative Subjunctive I

Wishes: E: God **save** the Queen!

G: Es **lebe** die Königin!

Instructions: E: Everyone **stand** up!

G: Alles **schweige**!

G: Man **nehme** zwei Eier.

Wishing: E: They wished that he **speak** on behalf of everyone.

G: Sie wünscht, daß er bald **gehe**.

Potential Subjunctive I

Conditions: E: If music **be** the food of love, play on.

G: Heute abend sehe ich fern, es **sei** denn, du gehst mit mir essen.

Concessives: E: It must be done, whatever **be** the cost.

G: **Sei** es auch noch so schwierig, er muß es tun.

Indirect speech (in German, expressing the speaker's impartiality about the factuality of a reported statement):

G: Günther sagt, daß Petra keine Zeit **habe**.

Hypothetical Situations (in English after 'lest'):

E: We should be quiet lest anyone **hear** us.

SUBJUNCTIVE II

The subjunctive II, or the unreal subjunctive, is also divided into the optative and the potential. The 'unreal optative' is used to express a desired action, which although wished for, has little if any chance of being realized. When an expression which is not a wish refers to a situation that does not exist, we are dealing with the 'unreal potential'.

Optative Subjunctive II

Wishes: E: If only I **had** more time!

G: Wenn sie nur wieder gesund **wäre**!

Potential Subjunctive II

Polite Requests: E: **Could** you ***open*** the door please?

G: **Könnten** Sie das Fenster bitte ***öffnen***?

Unreal conditions: E: If he **went**, he **wouldn't** ***enjoy*** himself.

G: Wenn er müde **wäre**, **würde** er jetzt nicht ***kommen***.

False Comparisons: E: He looks as if he **were** sick.

G: Er tut, als ob er betrunken **wäre**.

Exceptions and Unfulfilled Expectations (in German only):

G: Das Baby wird sterben, es **käme** denn die Ärztin.

G: Sie fängt an zu fotografieren, ohne daß sie Erlaubnis **hätte**.

Hypothetical situations: E: Suppose she **wouldn't** ***accept***: whom else could you take along?

G: Nehmen wir mal an, ich **käme** mit: wäre Platz im Auto für mich?

Indirect speech (in German, expressing the speaker's doubt about the factuality of the reported statement):

G: Günther sagt, daß Petra keine Zeit **hätte**.

The many meanings that the indicative, imperative and subjunctive moods can convey are affected by the many contexts that are part of the world in the speaker's perception. One must consider not so much the meaning of the verb in isolation as the meaning of the form within the given context. As a result, it has proved difficult to posit a 'basic' meaning for the subjunctive. Although such terms such as 'wish', 'hypothetical', 'unreal', 'uncertain', and 'possibility' are often used when dealing with the uses of the subjunctive, they still do not cover all of the meanings possible. For this reason, the following analysis is based primarily on grammatical rather than semantic divisions; the semantics will be discussed under grammatical headings.

1.2. Objectives of the Thesis

The primary objective of this comparative grammar of the English and German subjunctive is to assemble for the first time a complete overview consisting of commentary on sentences that exemplify all the forms and uses of the subjunctive. These examples, systematically analyzed and ordered, will enable us to make comparisons form by form, use by use between English and German. Such a comparison will hopefully create a clearer understanding of the subjunctive in English and German and the use of the results will aid in a clearer classroom presentation in the teaching process.

2. FORMS OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE

2.1. Forms of the Present Subjunctive I

2.1.1. English Present Subjunctive I Forms

The present subjunctive I, also referred to as the present subjunctive primary or simply present subjunctive, is formed in English by adding a zero-ending to the present infinitive stem of the verb, which is identical to the infinitive itself. The verbs ***to be*** and ***to have*** serve as examples:

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I	Pres. Ind.	Pres Subj. I
I *am*	I **be**	I *have*	I **have**
you *are*	you **be**[8]	you *have*	you **have**
s/he, it *is*	s/he, it **be**	s/he, it *has*	s/he, it **have**
we *are*	we **be**	we *have*	we **have**
they *are*	they **be**	they *have*	they **have**

The present subjunctive I forms of all other verbs differ from those of the present indicative only with the absence of the 's' in the third person singular.[9] Consider the verb ***to live***:

---

[8] In as far as 'thou' belongs to modern poetic language or is recognized as archaic, mention may be made of the corresponding verb forms: *art* (ind.), **be** (subj. I), *hast* (ind.), **have** (subj. I); *livest* (ind.), **live** (subj. I). Note archaic *liveth* and *loveth* (3rd pers. sg. ind.).

[9] If we base the pres. subj. I on the infinitive, English modal verbs would lack pres. subj. I since there are no infinitives to use as stems. On semantic grounds a case can be made for **may** in the sentence: <**May** they rest in peace.>. Thus a special rule must apply to the formation of subjunctive I derived from modals in English, which uses the finite indicative root as the stem for the present subjunctive I with a zero ending.

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
I *live*	I **live**
you *live*	you **live**
s/he, it *lives*	s/he, it **live**
we *live*	we **live**
they *live*	they **live**

2.1.1.1. Morpheme Analysis

	{Pres. Subj. I Stem Morpheme} +	{Subj. Inflection}	
{be} + {pres. subj. I}	→ /bi:/[10] +	Ø	
{have} + {pres. subj. I}	→ /hæv/ +	Ø	for all persons
{live} + {pres. subj. I}	→ /liv/ +	Ø	

In the formation of the English present subjunctive I, these verbs exemplify the use of a zero subjunctive morpheme added onto a present subjunctive I stem morpheme, which produces in the third person singular a contrast with the indicative /liv/ + /z/, with a non-zero ending morpheme. The analysis with a zero ending is adopted because endings do exist (*livest*, *lives*, *liveth* in the indicative) and because German has subjunctive endings by any analysis. Using the infinitve as a stem allows us to include the verbs ***to be*** and ***to have*** as obeying the rule. Hence the rule is without exception. When the lexical morpheme ({be} {have} {live} etc.) is combined with the grammatical morpheme ({Pres. Subj. I}), the result is the stem used for the present subjunctive I (which has the same form as the infinitive). Although, at this point, the form of the

[10] Phonemic length will be indicated by a colon, e.g., E: 'be' /bi:/ E: 'bit' /bit/. The diphthongs of English and German will be written as: /ai/ E: 'fine' /fain/ G: 'Bein' /bain/; /au/ E: 'house' /haus/ G: 'Haus' /haus/; /oi/ E: 'void' /void/ G: 'Häuser' /hoizər/.

present subjunctive I is reached, we choose, for the reasons given above, to posit zero personal endings in the morpheme ({Subjunctive Inflection}) producing zero (∅).

2.1.2. German Present Subjunctive I Forms

The German present subjunctive I, commonly referred to by grammarians as 'Konjunktiv I', is, like its counterpart in English, a very consistent construction. There are no vowel changes and the endings are added on to the present infinitive stem, as in English. It is important to note that the endings are the same for subjunctive I and II. These endings, which allow us as in English to posit a morpheme ({Subjunctive Inflection}), vary in German according to person and number.

1st and 3rd pers. sg.: add **-e**

2nd pers. sg.: add **-est**[11]

1st and 3rd pers. pl.: add **-en**

2nd pers. pl.: add **-et**

Notice the similarities and differences in the indicative and subjunctive verb forms with the verbs ***sein***, ***haben*** and ***werden*** serving as examples:

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I	Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
ich *bin*	ich **sei**	ich *habe*	ich **habe**
du *bist*	du **sei(e)st**[12]	du *hast*	du **habest**

[11] Durrell states that "the second person singular and plural forms in **-est** and **-et** are widely felt to be artificial and are seldom used. This means in practice that, for the most verbs except ***sein***, the only difference between Konjunktiv I and the present indicative is in the third person singular." Martin Durrell, Hammer's German Grammar and Usage (London: Edward Arnold, 1991) 236.

er, sie, es *ist*	er, sie, es **sei**	er, sie, es *hat*	er, sie, es **habe**
wir *sind*	wir **seien**	wir *haben*	wir **haben**
ihr *seid*	ihr **seiet**	ihr *habt*	ihr **habet**
Sie, sie *sind*	Sie, sie **seien**	Sie, sie *haben*	Sie, sie **haben**

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I	Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
ich *singe*	ich **singe**	ich *werde*	ich **werde**
du *singst*	du **singest**	du *wirst*	du **werdest**
er, sie, es *singt*	er, sie, es **singe**	er, sie, es *wird*	er, sie, es **werde**
wir *singen*	wir **singen**	wir *werden*	wir **werden**
ihr *singt*	ihr **singet**	ihr *werdet*	ihr **werdet**
Sie, sie *singen*	Sie, sie **singen**	Sie, sie *werden*	Sie, sie **werden**

The infinitive stem (infinitive minus -(e)n) remains unchanged, even in the case of strong and modal verbs. All verbs form their present subjunctive I in this manner, with the exception of the verb ***sein***, which does not take the first and third person singular subjunctive ending **-e**, but rather a zero ending. The irregular verb ***sein*** is also distinct from the indicative in all of its subjunctive forms, whereas regular verbs such as ***haben*** and ***singen*** are ambiguous in the first person singular and first and third person plural forms and ***werden*** in the first person singular and first, second and third person plural forms.

The subjunctive forms of verbs ending in ***-eln*** and ***-ern*** are identical to the indicative forms with the exception of the third person singular which is identical to the first person indicative and the subjunctive forms. The verbs ***sammeln*** and ***rudern*** serve as examples:

---

[12] Hammer maintains that the '**e**' in the 2nd pers. sg. pres. subj. form of the verb ***sein*** "is generally omitted in spoken German." Arnold Edward Hammer, German Grammar and Usage (London: Edward Arnold, 1983) 190.

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I	Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
ich *samm(e)le*	ich **samm(e)le**	ich *rud(e)re*	ich **rud(e)re**
du *sammelst*	du **sammelst**	du *ruderst*	du **ruderst**
er, sie, es *sammelt*	er, sie, es **samm(e)le**	er, sie, es *rudert*	er, sie, es **rud(e)re**
wir *sammeln*	wir **sammeln**	wir *rudern*	wir **rudern**
ihr *sammelt*	ihr **sammelt**	ihr *rudert*	ihr **rudert**
Sie, sie *sammeln*	Sie, sie **sammeln**	Sie, sie *rudern*	Sie, sie **rudern**

2.1.2.1. Morpheme Analysis

{Pres. Subj. I Stem Morpheme} + {Subj. Inflection}

{sein}+{pres. subj. I}→/zai/[13]
{haben}+{pres. subj. I} →/ha:b/ + {Subj. Infl.}+ [{sg.} {pl.}] + [{1st pers.} {2nd pers.} {3rd pers.}] → [/ə/ /əst/ ~ /st/ /ət/ ~ /t/ /ən/ ~ /n/]
{werden}+{pres. subj. I}→/ve:rd/
{singen}+{pres. subj. I}→/ziŋ/

We phrase the rules so that **/ə/** results from the combination {Subj. Infl.} + {sg.} + {1st pers.} and so on.

When a polysyllabic stem has an unstressed final syllable ending in ***l*** or ***r***, the **/ə/** ending is optionally preceded by either allomorph omitting or including the /ə/ in the final stem syllable, e.g. /zamәl/ + **/ə/** or /zaml/ + **/ə/** for the first and third person singular forms. Otherwise the stem /ə/ is retained and the unstressed **/ə/** of the subjunctive ending is repressed in the other forms of the present subjunctive I.

---

[13] ***Sein*** is the only verb that does not take the subjunctive ending **/ə/** in the 1st, 3rd and, in colloquial German, 2nd pers. sg. subj..

{sammeln} + {pres. subj. I} → /zaməl/ /zaml/

{rudern} + {pres. subj. I} → /rudər/ /rudr/

2.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) The present subjunctive I in English and German is formed on the basis of the infinitive stem. Unlike many rules in a language, this one is without exception in German as well as English except for the debatable case of modals in English.

(b) The present subjunctive I forms overlap greatly with those of the present indicative in both languages. Compare the English present indicative and present subjunctive I forms of the verb ***to live*** and the respective German forms of the verb ***leben***:

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I	Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
I *live*	I **live**	ich *lebe*	ich **lebe**
you *live*	you **live**	du *lebst*	du **lebest**
s/he, it *lives*	s/he, it **live**	er, sie, es *lebt*	er, sie, es **lebe**
we *live*	we **live**	wir *leben*	wir **leben**
they *live*	they **live**	ihr *lebt*	ihr **lebet**
		Sie, sie *leben*	Sie, sie **leben**

The present subjunctive I of regular verbs in English is ambiguous in all forms but the third person singular, which leads to a loss of appreciation for the subjunctive as a separate category. In German, the present subjunctive I forms are identical in the first person singular and first and third person plural of regular verbs. Verbs ending in ***-eln*** and ***-ern***, however, follow the English model of regular verbs with the third person singular form of present subjunctive I being the only distinct form from the indicative.

(c) The third person singular forms of the present subjunctive I in English and German are distinct from the third person singular forms of the present indicative.

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I	Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
s/he, it *loves*	s/he, it **love**	er, sie, es *liebt*	er, sie, es **liebe**
s/he, it *comes*	s/he, it **come**	er, sie, es *kommt*	er, sie, es **komme**

(d) By virtue of the analysis chosen, both English and German have subjunctive endings. This is not a surface parallel; on the surface there is a contrast (see below).

Contrasts

(a) The major contrast in the formation of the present subjunctive I in the two languages lies in the fact that the German stems take 'actual' endings (non-zero endings), whereas the English stems take zero endings. This contrast is due to the loss in English of all subjunctive inflections through the weakening of unstressed syllables.

2.2. Forms of the Present Subjunctive II

2.2.1. English Present Subjunctive II Forms

The present subjunctive II forms in English, also called 'present subjunctive secondary', 'past subjunctive' or simply 'unreal past' are created, following our analysis of the present subjunctive I, by adding a zero ending to the past stem. As an example of a regular weak verb, consider the verb ***to love***. The past tense indicative is formed from the present infinitive /lʌv/ and the past tense marker /d/. The past indicative /lʌvd/ is taken as the base for formation of the present subjunctive II, i.e. as the stem for the present subjunctive II. Since nothing is added, we may again speak of a zero ending, parallel to the present subjunctive I.

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
I *love*	I *loved*	I **loved**
you *love*	you *loved*	you **loved**
s/he, it *loves*	s/he, it *loved*	s/he, it **loved**
we *love*	we *loved*	we **loved**
they *love*	they *loved*	they **loved**

In all persons, the present subjunctive II forms are identical with the past indicative forms, with the exception of the verb ***to be*** (see below). Verbs that undergo a stem vowel change in the past tense retain the change in the subjunctive II forms, as the strong verb ***to speak*** exemplifies:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres Subj. II
I *speak*	I *spoke*	I **spoke**
you *speak*	you *spoke*	you **spoke**
s/he, it *speaks*	s/he, it *spoke*	s/he, it **spoke**
we *speak*	we *spoke*	we **spoke**
they *speak*	they *spoke*	they **spoke**

Some weak verbs also have vowel changes. These 'mixed verbs' follow the same pattern in forming the present subjunctive II. Examples of these shown in the third person singular are:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
bring	*brought*	**brought**
seek	*sought*	**sought**
sleep	*slept*	**slept**
creep	*crept*	**crept**

The only English verb which still has its own distinct forms in subjunctive II is ***to be*** in the first and third person singular, but even these two forms are becoming slowly obsolete and the growing tendency is to use the indicative forms[14]:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
I *am*	I *was*	**I were (was)**
you *are*	you *were*	you **were**
s/he, it *is*	s/he, it *was*	s/he, it **were (was)**
we *are*	we *were*	we **were**
they *are*	they *were*	they **were**

The modal verbs in English also belong to the mixed class and follow the same pattern for the formation of the present subjunctive II. Take for example the verbs ***can*** and ***will*** in the third person singular:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
can	*could*	**could**
will	*would*	**would**

---

[14] A. J. Thomson and A. V. Martinet state that the subjunctive II form of ***be*** "is either I/he/she/it **was** or I/he/she/it **were**. In expressions of doubt or unreality **were** is more usual than **was**: <He behaves as though he **were** the owner.> (But he is not the owner.) In conversation, however, **was** is often used instead of **were** [...]." A. J. Thomson and A. V. Martinet, A Practical English Grammar 4 ed. (Oxford: Oxford U P, 1991) 253.

2.2.1.1. Morpheme Analysis

		{Pres. Subj. II Stem Morpheme}			+	{Subj. Inflection}	
{love}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/lʌvd/	+	**Ø**	
{speak}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/spo:k/	+	**Ø**	
{bring}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/brat/	+	**Ø**	for all persons
{be}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/wɔr/	+	**Ø**	
{can}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/kʊd/	+	**Ø**	

We regard the present subjunctive II stem morpheme as consisting of /lʌv/ + stem formant /d/. This allows a contrast with the past indicative with {past} /d/ added to the root stem as an ending for all persons. Similarly /spo:k/ is a finite form in the past, but a stem in the subjunctive.[15]

2.2.2. German Present Subjunctive II Forms

The present subjunctive II of weak (regular) verbs in German is formed, as in English, by adding the subjunctive endings to the past stem. The verb ***lieben*** is a typical example:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *liebe*	ich *liebte*	ich **liebte**
du *liebst*	du *liebtest*	du **liebtest**
er, sie, es *liebt*	er, sie, es *liebte*	er, sie, es **liebte**
wir *lieben*	wir *liebten*	wir **liebten**
ihr *liebt*	ihr *liebtet*	ihr **liebtet**
Sie, sie *lieben*	Sie, sie *liebten*	Sie, sie **liebten**

[15] There is a weakness in this argument. Past indicative: thou *spokest/lovedst* requires an ending, making /spo:k/, /lʌvd/ into stems, not finite forms. These archaic forms, therefore need special treatment with the chosen analysis.

To determine the past stem, we start out with the assumption that German does have non-zero inflections for the present subjunctive II. We note further that the paradigm for the present subjunctive II has a constant sequence /li:pt/ followed by /ə/, /ə**st**/ etc. according to person and number. We therefore regard the variable set as endings for the present subjunctive I. The constant /li:pt/ is then the present subjunctive II stem. The finite form thus created is identical to that of the imperfect indicative, except where the stem vowel of otherwise regular weak verbs takes an umlaut, as is the case with the verb ***brauchen***[16] and ***haben***:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *habe*	ich *hatte*	ich **hätte**
du *hast*	du *hattest*	du **hättest**
er, sie, es *hat*	er, sie, es *hatte*	er, sie, es **hätte**
wir *haben*	wir *hatten*	wir **hätten**
ihr *habt*	ihr *hattet*	ihr **hättet**
Sie, sie *haben*	Sie, sie *hatten*	Sie, sie **hätten**

The mixed verbs in German form their subjunctive II in different ways. Three of the nine mixed verbs add an umlaut to the expected regular form. These verbs are shown in their third person singular forms:

---

[16] According to DUDEN, the alternate present subjunctive II form **bräuchte**, used in Southern Germany, is "landschaftlich" but Durrell goes on to say that the form is "widespread and not infrequently encountered in writing." Drosdowski et al., eds., Grammatik 126. Durrell 237.

Infinitive	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
bringen	*brachte*	**brächte**
denken	*dachte*	**dächte**
wissen	*wußte*	**wüßte**

The other six mixed verbs take the infinitive stem (infinitive minus -(e)n) to which the subjunctive endings are added.[17] Again, the verbs are shown in the third person singular forms:

Infinitive	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
brennen	*brannte*	**[brennte]**[18]
kennen	*kannte*	**kennte**
nennen	*nannte*	**[nennte]**
rennen	*rannte*	**[rennte]**
senden	*sendete/sandte*	**sendete**
wenden	*wandte/wendete*	**wendete**

Members of this group consequently form the present subjunctive II as if they were regular weak verbs: /brent/ + /ə/ etc..

Strong verbs form their present subjunctive II by adding the subjunctive endings to the past stem and adding an umlaut to the stem vowel if possible. Umlauting is possible when the

---

[17] In the case of ***brennen*** and ***rennen***, the past indicative forms are in historical fact umlauted. For consistency the pres. subj. II forms **brennte** and **rennte** would therefore be more logically spelt: ***brännte**; ***rännte**. Early grammarians did not recognize the forms as being umlauted and settled on the spelling with **e** for the pres. subj. II.

[18] If the form is considered to be stilted, it is enclosed by square parentheses. The less common alternative forms are in round parentheses, following the more frequently used forms. Durrell 238-46.

past indicative has the stem vowels /a/: half, **hälfe**; /a:/: saß, **säße**, /o/: floß, **flösse** /o:/ zog, **zöge** or /u:/: trug, **trüge**.[19] The strong verbs ***sein***, ***werden***, ***sprechen*** and ***gehen*** serve as examples:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *bin*	ich *war*	ich **wäre**
du *bist*	du *warst*	du **wär(e)st**[20]
er, sie, es *ist*	er, sie, es *war*	er, sie, es **wäre**
wir *sind*	wir *waren*	wir **wären**
ihr *seid*	ihr *wart*	ihr **wär(e)t**
Sie, sie *sind*	Sie, sie *waren*	Sie, sie **wären**

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *werde*	ich *wurde*	ich **würde**
du *wirst*	du *wurdest*	du **würdest**
er, sie, es *wird*	er, sie, es *wurde*	er, sie, es **würde**
wir *werden*	wir *wurden*	wir **würden**
ihr *werdet*	ihr *wurdet*	ihr **werdet**
Sie, sie *werden*	Sie, sie *wurden*	Sie, sie **würden**

[19] No modern past indicative has a short /u/ but in a historical perspective the existence of the irregular subjunctive **hülfe**, **stünde** etc. is due to MHG *hulfen*, *stunden* etc. with short /u/.

[20] When the imperfect indicative form is distinct form the subjunctive II form because of an umlaut, the **e** is sometimes left out of the 2nd pers. sing. and 2nd pers. pl. subjunctive II forms in spoken German. There are two exceptions: the **e** cannot be dropped if the stem ends in a sibilant or 'd' or 't'. Hammer 191.

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *spreche*	ich *sprach*	ich **spräche**
du *sprichst*	du *sprachst*	du **sprächest**
er, sie, es *spricht*	er, sie, es *sprach*	er, sie, es **spräche**
wir *sprechen*	wir *sprachen*	wir **sprächen**
ihr *sprecht*	ihr *spracht*	ihr **sprächet**
Sie, sie *sprechen*	Sie, sie *sprachen*	Sie, sie **sprächen**

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *gehe*	ich *ging*	ich **ginge**
du *gehst*	du *gingst*	du **gingest**
er, sie, es *geht*	er, sie, es *ging*	er, sie, es **ginge**
wir *gehen*	wir *gingen*	wir **gingen**
ihr *geht*	ihr *gingt*	ihr **ginget**
Sie, sie *gehen*	Sie, sie *gingen*	Sie, sie **gingen**

Some irregular verbs form their subjunctive II in the regular manner but sound rather archaic and are usually limited to the written and/or poetic language. The following are examples given in the third person singular:

Infinitive	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
beginnen	*begann*	**[begänne (begönne)]**[21]
brechen	*brach*	**bräche**
essen	*aß*	**äße**

[21] In DUDEN, the alternate subjunctive II forms are explained as follows: "Da hier die auf Ausgleich und Eindeutigkeit zielende sprachgeschichtliche Entwicklung in einigen Fällen noch nicht abgeschlossen ist, stehen bei manchen Verben heute noch verschiedene Konjunktivformen nebeneinander[.]" Drosdowski et al., eds., Grammatik 125.

fahren	*fuhr*	**führe**
fliegen	*flog*	**flöge**
fressen	*fraß*	**[fräße]**
gewinnen	*gewann*	**[gewänne/gewönne]**
helfen	*half*	**[hülfe (hälfe)]**
laden	*lud*	**[lüde]**
lesen	*las*	**[läse]**
nehmen	*nahm*	**nähme**
riechen	*roch*	**[röche]**
saufen	*soff*	**[söffe]**
schelten	*schalt*	**[schölte]**
schließen	*schloß*	**schlösse**
schwimmen	*schwamm*	**[schwömme (schwämme)]**
schwören	*schwor*	**[schwüre (schwöre)]**
sehen	*sah*	**sähe**
spinnen	*spann*	**[spönne (spänne)]**
stehen	*stand*	**stünde (stände)**
sterben	*starb*	**stürbe**
tragen	*trug*	**trüge**
verderben	*verdarb*	**[verdürbe]**
verlieren	*verlor*	**verlöre**
wachsen	*wuchs*	**wüchse**
waschen	*wusch*	**[wüsche]**
werben	*warb*	**[würbe]**
werfen	*warf*	**[würfe]**
ziehen	*zog*	**zöge**

It is virtually impossible to state firmly which subjunctive II forms of irregular verbs are not in use since it is dependent on personal preference and/or age of the speaker or writer. In general, forms having the stem vowel **ö** e.g. **flössen** (pres. subj. II) or **ü** e.g. **wüschen** (pres. subj. II) and forms with the stem vowel **ä** which are homophonic with to those of the indicative e.g. **hälfen** (pres. subj. II), *helfen* (pres. ind.) tend to belong to the less frequently used group of subjunctive verb forms. Also for many German speakers **sähen** (pres. subj. II) and *sehen* (pres. ind.) are identical in pronunciation. The unusual present subjunctive II forms tend to be replaced by **würde** + ***infinitive***.

Modal auxiliaries divide into two groups: (a) with umlaut in the present subjunctive II (**dürfte**, **könnte**, **möchte**, **müßte** contrast with past indicative *durfte* etc.) (b) with no umlaut in the present subjunctive II (**sollte** and **wollte** overlapping with past indicative *sollte* and *wollte*). The verbs ***dürfen*** and ***können***, which take the umlaut in the present subjunctive II, serve as examples from the first group:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *darf*	ich *durfte*	ich **dürfte**
du *darfst*	du *durftest*	du **dürftest**
er, sie, es *darf*	er, sie, es *durfte*	er, sie, es **dürfte**
wir *dürfen*	wir *durften*	wir **dürften**
ihr *dürft*	ihr *durftet*	ihr **dürftet**
Sie, sie *dürfen*	Sie, sie *durften*	Sie, sie **dürften**

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *kann*	ich *konnte*	ich **könnte**
du *kannst*	du *konntest*	du **könntest**
er, sie, es *kann*	er, sie, es *konnte*	er, sie, es **könnte**
wir *können*	wir *konnten*	wir **könnten**

ihr *könnt*	ihr *konntet*	ihr **könntet**
Sie, sie *können*	Sie, sie *konnten*	Sie, sie **könnten**

The verbs ***sollen*** and ***wollen*** belong to the second group of verbs that does not take an umlaut in the present subjunctive II. Notice the lack of distinctiveness between the past indicative and the present subjunctive II forms in all persons:

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *soll*	ich *sollte*	ich **sollte**
du *sollst*	du *solltest*	du **solltest**
er, sie, es *soll*	er, sie, es *sollte*	er, sie, es **sollte**
wir *sollen*	wir *sollten*	wir **sollten**
ihr *sollt*	ihr *solltet*	ihr **solltet**
Sie, sie *sollen*	Sie, sie *sollten*	Sie, sie **sollten**

Pres. Ind.	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *will*	ich *wollte*	ich **wollte**
du *willst*	du *wolltest*	du **wolltest**
er, sie, es *will*	er, sie, es *will*	er, sie, es **wollte**
wir *wollen*	wir *wollten*	wir **wollten**
ihr *wollt*	ihr *wolltet*	ihr **wolltet**
Sie, sie *wollen*	Sie, sie *wollten*	Sie, sie **wollten**

2.2.2.1. Morpheme Analysis

{Pres. Subj. II Stem Morpheme} + {Subjunctive Inflection}

{lieben}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/li:pt/				
{haben}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/hɛt/				
{bringen}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/brɛχt/	[{sg.}]	+ [1st pers.]	[/ə/	
{brennen}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/brɛnt/	+	[2nd pers.]	/əst/	
{sein}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/vɛ:r/	[{pl.}]	+ [3rd pers.]	/ət/	
{werden}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/vyrd/			/ən/]	
{sprechen}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/špre:ç/				
{gehen}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/giŋ/				
{dürfen }	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/dyrft/				
{sollen}	+	{pres. subj. II}	→	/zolt/				

The combination of the lexical morpheme ({lieben}) with the grammatical morpheme ({pres. subj. II}) forms a stem. The inflections are supplied by a combination of {subjunctive inflection } with either {sg.} or {pl.} and one of the three person morphemes. This combination yields **/ə/** for {subj. inflection} + {sg.} + {1st pers.} etc.. This analysis allows a contrast with the past indicative, even where homophones exist: past indicative - /li:p/ (root/stem) + /tə/ past inflection. On the other hand, present subjunctive II /li:p/ (root) + /t/ (pres. subj. II stem formant) + **/ə/** personal inflection.

2.2.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) The forms in English and German are based on a stem, to which the subjunctive endings are added, i.e. third person singular:

English /lʌvd/ + **/Ø/**

German /li:pt/ + **/ə/**

The stem is analyzed as root + stem marker + personal ending.

(b) The stem in both languages is identical in form to the past indicative or modified by umlauting.

(c) Both analyses feature a stem formant for the present subjunctive II, contrasting with a root/stem for the past indicative:

/lʌv/ + /d/ + /**Ø**/ → /li:p/ + /t/ + /**ə**/ (pres. subj. II)

contrasting with

/lʌv/ + /d/ → /li:p/ + /tə/ (past ind.)

(d) The irregular forms show that historically it is the plural stem of the past indicative that was used as the stem. Examples of this are the English third person subjunctive II forms ***were*** and German ***hülfen***:

	Pres. sg.	Past sg.	Past pl.	Past Part.
Principal parts:	*is*	*was*	***were***	been
MHG:	*helfen*	*half*	***hulfen***	geholfen

The present subjunctive II **were** is still clearly derived from the indicative past plural *were*. Similarly in Middle High German, the indicative past plural umlautable stem *hulf* was modified for use with the subjunctive endings, giving MHG **hülfe**, **hülfest** etc., forms which were maintained in New High German, in spite of the loss of the plural indicative *hulfen*. (Cf. also MHG *werden*, *wart*, *wurden*, *worden* - modern present subjunctive II **würde**.)

(c) In both languages, subjunctive II forms are identical with the past indicative of regular verbs:

Past Ind.	(overlaps with) Pres. Subj. II	Past Ind.	(overlaps with) Pres. Subj. II
I *loved*	I **loved**	ich *liebte*	ich **liebte**
you *loved*	you **loved**	du *liebtest*	du **liebtest**
s/he, it *loved*	s/he, it **loved**	er, sie, es *liebte*	er, sie,es **liebte**
we *loved*	we **loved**	wir *liebten*	wir **liebten**
they *loved*	they **loved**	ihr *liebtet*	ihr **liebtet**
		Sie, sie *liebten*	Sie, sie **liebten**

Contrasts

(a) The English forms have a zero ending, whereas the German present subjunctive II forms use an 'actual' ending:

E: Pres. Subj. II	G: Pres. Subj. II
I **spoke** /spo:k/	ich **spräche** /ʃprɛ:çə/

(b) When possible in strong verbs, the stem vowel in German takes an umlaut, allowing the present subjunctive II forms to differ from those of the past indicative; the English stem, of course, does not. Even some weak verbs in German take an umlaut to form the subjunctive II forms: e.g. **hätte**; **bräuchte**.

Past. Ind.	Pres Subj. II	Past. Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
I *spoke*	I **spoke**	ich *sprach*	ich **spräche**
you *spoke*	you **spoke**	du *sprachst*	du **sprächest**
s/he, it *spoke*	s/he, it **spoke**	er, sie, es *sprach*	er, sie, es **spräche**
we *spoke*	we **spoke**	wir *sprachen*	wir **sprächen**
they *spoke*	they **spoke**	ihr *spracht*	ihr **sprächet**
		Sie, sie *sprachen*	Sie, sie **sprächen**

(c) In German, the modal auxiliaries ***dürfen***, ***können***, ***mögen*** and ***müssen*** take an umlaut on the present subjunctive II stem vowel.

(d) These three contrasting points create forms which are unambiguously present subjunctive II forms in German, whereas English has only **were** as an optional distinctive third person singular of the verb ***to be***.

2.3. Forms of the Past Subjunctive I

2.3.1. English Past Subjunctive I Forms

In English, the past subjunctive I is created by using the present subjunctive I form of the auxiliary ***to have*** and the past participle of the main verb.

Pres. Subj. I	+	Past Participle
I **have**		
you **have**		
s/he, it **have**	+	spoken
we **have**		
they **have**		

2.3.2. German Past Subjunctive I Forms

The past subjunctive I in German is formed by combining the present subjunctive I form of the auxiliary ***sein*** or ***haben*** with the past participle of the main verb.

Pres. Subj. I	+	Past Participle	Pres. Subj. I	+	Past Participle
ich **sei**			ich **habe**		
du **sei(e)st**			du **habest**		
er, sie, es **sei**	+	gegangen	er, sie, es **habe**	+	gemacht
wir **seien**			wir **haben**		

ihr **seiet**	ihr **habet**
Sie, sie **seien**	Sie, sie **haben**

2.3.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, the past subjunctive I is created by using the present subjunctive I form of the auxiliary and the past participle of the main verb:

Pres. Subj. I +	Past Participle	→	Past Subjunctive I
E: s/he, it **have**	spoken	→	**have** spoken
G: er, sie, es **habe**	gemacht	→	**habe** gemacht
G: er, sie, es **sei**	gegangen	→	**sei** gegangen

Contrasts

(a) In German, the degree of differentiation in the past subjunctive I is greater than in English. In English the past subjunctive I for all persons is constructed with the auxiliary **have** + the past participle. English subjunctive **have** is identical in form to all persons in the indicative with the exception of the third person singular. In German, the subjunctive I of the auxiliary ***sein*** is distinct from the indicative in all forms. The subjunctive I forms of the auxiliary **haben** differ from the indicative in the third person singular and the second person singular and plural.

English:

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
I *have*	I **have**
you *have*	you **have**
s/he, it *has*	s/he, it **have**
we *have*	we **have**
they *have*	they **have**

German:

Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I	Pres. Ind.	Pres. Subj. I
ich *bin*	ich **sei**	ich *habe*	ich **habe**
du *bist*	du **sei(e)st**	du *hast*	du **habest**
er, sie, es *ist*	er, sie, es **sei**	er, sie, es *hat*	er, sie, es **habe**
wir *sind*	wir **seien**	wir *haben*	wir **haben**
ihr *seid*	ihr **seiet**	ihr *habt*	ihr **habet**
Sie, sie *sind*	Sie, sie **seien**	Sie, sie *haben*	Sie, sie **haben**

2.4. Forms of the Past Subjunctive II

2.4.1. English Past Subjunctive II Forms

The English past subjunctive II is formed with the present subjunctive II **had** and the past participle of the main verb.

Pres. Subj. I	+	Past Participle
I **had**		
you **had**		
s/he, it **had**	+	spoken
we **had**		
they **had**		

2.4.2. German Past Subjunctive II Forms

In German, the past subjunctive II is formed by putting the present subjunctive II form of the auxiliary verbs ***sein*** or ***haben*** together with the past participle of the main verb.

Pres. Subj. II	+	Past Participle	Pres. Subj. II	+	Past Participle
ich **wäre**			ich **hätte**		
du **wär(e)st**			du **hättest**		
er, sie, es **wäre**	+	gegangen	er, sie, es **hätte**	+	gemacht
wir **wären**			wir **hätten**		
ihr **wär(e)t**			ihr **hättet**		
Sie, sie **wären**			Sie, sie **hätten**		

2.4.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In both English and German, the past subjunctive II is formed by the present subjunctive II form of the auxiliary and the past participle of the main verb:

Pres. Subj. II	+	Past Participle	→	Past Subjunctive II
E: s/he, it **had**		spoken	→	**had** spoken
G: er, sie, es **hätte**		gemacht	→	**hätte** gemacht
G: er, sie, es **wäre**		gegangen	→	**wäre** gegangen

Contrasts

(a) Just as is the case with the past subjunctive I in German, the degree of differentiation in the German past subjunctive II is greater than in English. In English, the past subjunctive I for all persons is formed by putting the auxiliary **had** with the past participle of the main verb. English subjunctive **had** is identical in form to all persons in the past indicative, whereas the subjunctive II of the auxiliary verbs ***sein*** and ***haben*** in German is distinct from the past indicative in all forms.

English:

Past. Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
I *had*	I **had**
you *had*	you **had**
s/he, it *had*	s/he, it **had**
we *had*	we **had**
they *had*	they **had**

German:

Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II	Past Ind.	Pres. Subj. II
ich *war*	ich **wäre**	ich *hatte*	ich **hätte**
du *warst*	du **wär(e)st**	du *hattest*	du **hättest**
er, sie, es *war*	er, sie, es **wäre**	er, sie, es *hatte*	er, sie, es **hätte**
wir *waren*	wir **wären**	wir *hatten*	wir **hätten**
ihr *wart*	ihr **wär(e)t**	ihr *hattet*	ihr **hättet**
Sie, sie *waren*	Sie, sie **wären**	Sie, sie *hatten*	Sie, sie **hätten**

3. USES OF THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE I

There are two classes of use of the subjunctive referred to as 'optative' and 'potential'. The optative subjunctive "represents the utterance as something desired or planned", whereas the potential subjunctive "represents the statement, not as an actual fact, but only as a conception of the mind."[22] First, the optative will be analyzed in terms of the present subjunctive I in independent clauses and subordinate clauses, with the latter being divided into two subsections: 'adverb' and 'noun clauses'. Second, the potential subjunctive will be discussed in terms of its uses in subordinate adverb and noun clauses. This type of division will show that the meaning of the subjunctive varies depending on syntactic environment as well as semantic context.

3.1. Optative Subjunctive I

The optative subjunctive "represents the utterance as something which is desired or planned," and indicates hope of fulfillment.[23] In this section we will deal with the optative subjunctive I used in 'wishes' and 'instructions' in independent clauses, 'conditions' and 'final clauses' in adverb clauses and, finally, in noun clauses of 'wishing'.

3.1.1. Independent Clauses

A typical independent clause, in English and German, is a clause which can stand alone and still make sense; it consists of at least a subject and a predicate. A minimum independent clause, however, may lack all elements but the verb, i.e. 'Come!'; 'Komm!'. However, the requirement that it make sense on its own is questionable, as some of the examples below will illustrate. Let us now look at wishes and instructions expressed by means of independent clauses.

---

[22] Curme, English Grammar 234.

[23] George O. Curme, A Grammar of the German Language (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1952) 216.

3.1.1.1. Subjunctive I in Wishes in English

Perhaps the most common use of the present subjunctive in an English independent clause is the expressing of possible wishes which are typically directed toward supernatural powers and have, over time, become set phrases. Such wishes employ the third person singular subjunctive I forms. Consider the following examples:

1. God **bless** you!
2. God **save** the Queen!
3. God **help** us!
4. God **have** mercy on your soul!
5. God **protect** you!
6. God **give** me strength!
7. Heaven **help** you!
8. Heaven **forbid**!
9. Heaven **see** you safely home!
10. Lord **have** mercy on us!
11. The Lord **take** care of her!
12. Long **live** liberty!
13. Devil **take** him!
14. God **rest** you merry, gentlemen!

The following wishes make no reference to supernatural powers. Although many of the examples listed above are set expressions, the category is still active since forms can be created; these are, however, rare and are considered formal style. The following serve as examples:

15. **Suffice** it to say that...
16. Far **be** it from me...
17. So **be** it.
18. Thy will **be** done.

In some set expressions only fragments now remain:

19. [God] **damn** [it]!

20. [God] **confound** it!

21. [God] **bless** you!

22 [God] **bless** my soul!

23. Glory **be** [to God]!

There are a few expressions which have undergone phonetic changes. These shortened forms have now become the accepted forms in both spoken and written English:

24. Good**bye**! [God **be** with you!] /gudbai/

25. **Drat** it! [God **rot** it!] /drætit/

26. Swel**pme**! [So **help** me God!] /swelpmi:/

27. **Blim**y! [God **blind** me!] /blaimi:/

This older usage of subjunctive I has survived in rather archaic expressions and the tendency today is to use **may** + ***infinitive*** when conveying a wish. Although it is considered to be an elevated style it is quite common. Consider these examples:

28. **May** the Lord ***take*** care of her!

29. **May** I never ***see*** his face again!

30. **May** freedom ***live***!

31. **May** you ***prosper***!

32. **May** the best man ***win***!

In addition to using **may**, the ***let*** + ***infinitive*** constructions are common alternatives to the present subjunctive I forms.[24] It is interesting to note that **may** is used when the power involved is superhuman or the hearer is not in control. The ***let*** + ***infinitive*** construction is used when the hearer has some control over the desired outcome or where there is reasonable expectation of fulfillment. This reflects the imperative mood of ***let***. This construction has a

---

[24] Requests employing 'let' are to be understood as wishes.

tendency to urge the hearer to allow something to be done, since it is the same as clear commands like <***Let*** the dog ***run*** around.> or <***Let*** me ***help*** you.>. Consider the following examples:

33. ***Let*** it ***be*** so!
34. ***Let*** him ***be***!
35. ***Let*** there ***be*** light!
36. ***Let*** nothing you ***dismay***!

If we look at example 35, God would not say <**May** there ***be*** light.> Since there is an expectation that the wish will be fulfilled, the ***let*** + ***infinitive*** construction must be used. In example 36, ***let*** is used because the hearer does have some control over the desired outcome.

Wishes in the first person plural are expressed by using the ***let*** + ***infinitive***. The following serve as examples:

37. *Let* us ***go***!
38. *Let* us ***pray***!

3.1.1.2. Subjunctive I in Wishes in German

In German, possible wishes are often conveyed using subjunctive I forms in the third person singular. These are generally set expressions which may sound rather archaic but are nevertheless still in use today. As in English, the wishes are often directed at supernatural powers. Some examples are:

1. Gott **sei** dank!
2. Gott **helfe** dir!
3. Gott **segne** den König!
4. Das **walte** Gott!
5. **Gebe** Gott!
6. **Hol'** dich der Teufel! / **Hol'** ihn der Teufel! / **Hol'** es der Teufel!
7. Dein Reich **komme**, Dein Wille **geschehe**.

8. **Vergelt's** Gott!

Wishes that do not appeal to supernatural powers exist in German just as in English. This category is still productive in German as well, although such wishes are considered to be high style or even archaic. Consider these examples:

9. Er **lebe** hoch!
10. Lange **lebe** der König!
11. Er **ruhe** sanft!
12. So **sei** es!
13. Es **werde** Licht!
14. Es **sage** uns niemand, was zu tun sei[25]!
15. Es **komme** doch niemand mit einer solchen Bitte zu mir!
16. Man **denke** nur an die Folgen!
17. Er **komme** herein!

In German, some set expressions have experienced word omissions and, as in English, only fragments remain:

18. [Gott] **behüte** [es]!
19. [Gott] **bewahre** [es]!
20. [Es **sei**] verdammt!

In addition to the set expressions which express wishes, modal verbs in their present subjunctive I forms are also employed to convey desires. Just as the modern tendency in English is to use ***may*** + ***infinitive*** where possible, so is it very common in the German language of today to use the modal verb ***mögen*** + ***infinitive***. This construction is very effective in wishes with the modal force of the subjunctive being added to that of ***mögen***. Observe the following examples:

21. Es **möge** ***bekommen***!
22. **Möge** euch das kommende Jahr viel Glück und Freude ***bringen***!

---

[25] The subjunctive form **sei** in example 14 is subjunctive of indirect speech, not of wish.

23. **Möge** sie immer glücklich ***sein***!

24. Sie **möge** mich bitte ***zurückrufen***.

When the hearer is not in a position to alter the outcome, ***mögen + infinitive*** is used, as seen in the above examples. Where the hearer might have or does have influence or control over the desired outcome, the tendency is to use the ***lassen*** (imperative form) + ***infinitive*** construction. Consider these examples:

25. ***Laß*** ihn ***hereinkommen***!

rather than

26. Er **möge** ***hereinkommen***!

Example 26 <Er **möge** ***hereinkommen***!> sounds very formal and does not imply that the hearer will allow the action. Let us consider two more examples:

27. ***Laß*** das ***sein***!

28. ***Laß*** es gut ***sein***!

These are clear imperatives directed at the hearer since no other being is involved.

In wishes in the first person plural, the subjunctive I form as well as the ***lassen*** (imperative) + ***infinitive*** is used:

29. **Gehen** wir!

30. **Beten** wir!

* 31. ***Laßt*** uns ***gehen***!

32. ***Laßt*** uns ***beten***!

The pragmatics of first person plural suppresses the appeal to the hearer to let something happen because the speaker is involved in the same desired action. It therefore expresses a wish, rather than an imperative sense. Hence <**Gehen** wir!> and <***Laß*** uns ***gehen***!> have the same meaning, whereas in other persons they diverge: subjunctive I - pure wish; ***laß(t)*** + ***infinitive*** - exhortation to allow.

The less common modal construction ***wollen + infinitive*** may also be employed to draw the reader's or listener's attention to a particular piece of information within the wish.[26] The following serves as an example:

33. Auch **wolle** man nicht ***übersehen***, daß dieser Faktor zeitbedingt ist.

Just as <**Gehen** wir!> is formally a subjunctive, so is <**Seien** Sie>; <**Gehen** Sie> etc. These forms are called polite imperatives which are in morphological and historical perspective present subjunctive I forms expressing a wish.

3.1.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) Possible wishes can be expressed in English and German by employing present subjunctive I forms in set phrases. Such expressions as <God **bless** you> and <Gott **sei** Dank> express wishes which have the potential of being fulfilled. Even though the speaker may have little or no control over the outcome, the possibility of the wish being realized exists. As shown by the examples in both languages, the wishes are often directed at supernatural powers.

(b) Fossilization of the subjunctive I is not yet complete in either English or German. There are set expressions which employ subjunctive I forms but new expressions using subjunctive I forms can on occasion be created. The following are examples of archaic set expressions employing the present subjunctive I in English and German and the same subjunctive I forms in freely created wishes in both languages:

set expressions:
E: **May** you ***prosper***!
G: Es **möge** ***bekommen***!

freely created wishes:
E: **May** her life ***be*** long and joyful!
G: Sie **möge** sobald wie möglich ***hereinkommen***!

---

[26] Curme, German Language 217.

(c) Subjunctive I forms in independent clauses in both English and German are most frequently found in set expressions which, although archaic in verb form, are still used as phrases in the modern language. The following expressions serve as examples:

E: God **bless** you!

G: Gott **helfe** dir!

E: So **be** it!

G: So **sei** es!

(d) In both English and German, there are shortened oaths:

E: [God]**damn** [it]!

G: [Gott] **bewahre** [es]!

(e) One modern tendency in both English and German is to use ***may*** or ***möge***, respectively, to convey a wish. When this is done, the subjunctive of the main verb is dropped and the subjunctive meaning is found in the modal. This expresses wishes over which the hearer has no control:

E: **May** the best man ***win***!

G: **Möge** sie immer glücklich ***sein***!

(f) Another modern expression of wishes in English and German may use ***let + infinitive*** and ***lassen + infinitive*** constructions respectively. These express wishes in the form of an imperative of ***let lassen*** and hence the speaker is normally expected to have some control over the desired outcome. For example:

E: ***Let*** it ***be***.

G: ***Laß*** es ***sein***.

(g) In both English and German, wishes for the first person plural use ***let / lassen*** (imperative, grammatically second person) + ***infinitive*** constructions. Since the speaker would participate in the desired action, an exhortation, more than an imperative is being expressed:

E: ***Let***'s ***go***!

G: ***Laß / Laßt*** uns ***gehen***!

In the third person it has a range of meanings from wish to command:

E: ***Let*** the band ***play*** on!

G: ***Laß*** die Kappelle ***weiterspielen***!

E: ***Let*** the dog ***run*** around!

G: ***Laß*** den Hund ***herumlaufen***!

Contrasts

(a) German has no obscured subjunctive forms like in English the word 'Goodbye'.

(b) English does not have a form with the modality of a polite imperative which is morphologically subjunctive like in German <**Gehen** wir!>; <**Gehen** Sie!> etc..

3.1.1.4. Subjunctive I in Instructions in English

In English, instructions may be expressed using present subjunctive I forms. These subjunctive forms are especially effective in functioning in place of nonexistent 3rd person singular and plural imperatives. The following serve as examples:

1. Nobody **move**!
2. Nobody **leave** the room!
3. Everyone **go** home!
4. Everyone **stand** up!
5. All **change**!

The older use of the present subjunctive I in instructions in English is commonly replaced by the imperative or the construction ***let + infinitive***. Consider the following examples:

6. Add a cup of sugar.
7. Bring the mixture to a boil.
8. Beat until stiff.
9. ***Let*** no one ***tell*** me such nonsense!
10. ***Let*** no one ***throw*** the first stone!

11. ***Let*** battle ***commence***!

12. ***Let*** everyone ***start*** with $200.

13. ***Let*** A ***be*** a point on the line X Y.[27]

3.1.1.5. Subjunctive I in Instructions in German

The present subjunctive I is often used to express an instruction in the form of an order which is directed at a third person, for which there is no third person imperative in German or English.

1. Man **nehme** 2 Eier, ein Pfund Mehl und **gieße** etwas Wasser dazu.

2. Man **nehme** dreimal täglich eine Tablette nach dem Essen.

3. Alles **schweige**!

The German polite imperative forms for the second person plural of all verbs are historically old present subjunctive I forms in the third person plural. The verb ***sein*** serves as a clear example:

4. Seien Sie ruhig!

5. Seien Sie vorsichtig!

In modern German instructions, the subjunctive is frequently replaced by the imperative; directly addressing the listener or reader, i.e., <Drücken Sie den Auslöser vollständig durch.>; another variant uses the ***infinitive***, i.e., <Die geschlagenen Eier in den Teig ***rühren***.>; another employs ***sollen*** + ***infinitive***, i.e., <Sie sollen um 9 Uhr wiederkommen.>

The subjunctive I is also traditionally used to express the given parameters of a mathematical deduction or draw special attention to specific information. In these instances ***sein*** is the most frequently used verb:

6. *A* **sei** ein Punkt auf der Strecke *PQ*.

7. **Sei** *A* gleich *B*, falls $x > 5$.

---

[27] It is impossible to say: <*A be a point on the line X Y.> See Curme, English Grammar 238.

8. **Gelte** $x > 0$.

9. Es **gebe** ein $\varepsilon > 0$...

10. Es **existiere** eine Funktion, die den folgenden Bedingungen genügt.

11. Dabei **stehe** Π für die Menge der Polynome.

12. In der Tabelle **sei** *y* für *f(x)*.

13. Hierbei **sei** erwähnt, daß es sich um einen besonders empfindlichen Film handelt.

14. Der Leser **sei** vor solchen Fällen gewarnt.

3.1.1.6. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In both English and German, the present subjunctive I functions in place of the nonexistent third person singular and plural imperative. Consider the following examples:

E: Nobody **leave** the room!

G: Man **nehme** dreimal täglich eine Tablette nach dem Essen.

E: Everyone **stand** up!

G: Alles **schweige**!

(b) The present subjunctive I forms are either completely (as in English) or dominantly (as in German) replaced with imperatives.

E: Add a cup of sugar.

G: Drücken Sie den Auslöser vollständig durch.

Contrasts

(a) The present subjunctive I in English instructions has been largely replaced with ***let*** + ***infinitive***, whereas the equivalent present subjunctive I in German has been better maintained.

E: ***Let*** battle ***commence***!

E: ***Let*** everyone ***start*** with $200.

E: *Let* A *be* a point on the line X Y.

G: **Sei** *A* gleich *B*, falls $x > 5$.

G: Man **nehme** dreimal täglich eine Tablette nach dem Essen.

G: Alles **schweige**!

G: Es **gebe** ein $\varepsilon > 0$...

(b) In German, only the present subjunctive I may also be replaced with the ***infinitive*** or ***sollen*** + ***infinitive***.

G: Die geschlagenen Eier in den Teig ***rühren***.

G: Sie sollen um 9 Uhr wiederkommen.

3.1.2. Subordinate Clauses

The optative subjunctive in subordinate clauses can be used in conditions and final clauses.

3.1.2.1. Adverb Clauses

3.1.2.1.1. Subjunctive I in Conditions in English

An optative condition, according to Curme, consists of two clauses "linked by 'and' or unlinked, the first of which is an expression of will"[28] containing an optative subjunctive I.[29] In such a condition, the 'if' is not present and the sentence begins with the subjunctive form of the verb, followed by a resultative clause. The subjunctive I in optative conditions is restricted to a few set expressions in English such as:

---

[28] Curme, English Grammar 193.

[29] Following Curme, I include 'optative conditions' at this point, without being fully certain that these are such. Curme makes mention of such conditions of will under the volitive subjunctive, which in his analysis is a subcategory of the optative. He does, however, also say that the verb in the first clause could be an imperative, which would in turn mean that an introductory 'if' is not implied. I believe the verb to be in the present subjunctive I form and therefore include 'optative conditions' in this comparative grammar. Arguments could, however, be made against this interpretation. Curme, English Grammar 193.

1. **Sow** nothing, reap nothing.[30]

(If you sow nothing, you reap nothing! / If you sow nothing, you will reap nothing.)

2. **Love** me, love my dog.[31]

3. **Waste** not, want not.

4. **Give** him an inch and he'll take a mile.[32]

5. **Give** him a finger, he'll take an arm.

The status of the bolded verbs is discussable. Since no subject is stated, these could be seen as imperatives, which if acted upon, trigger the event of the second clause. Another possibility is that they are telegram-style reductions to bare root forms.

3.1.2.1.2. Subjunctive I in Conditions in German

Subjunctive I in optative conditions in German is archaic and restricted to older texts. For the purpose of comparison, let us consider the following two examples; the first a quotation from Goethe's Vier Jahreszeiten (74) and the second from Faust (Studierzimmer):

1. Bald, es **kenne** nur jeder den eigenen, **gönne** dem andern seinen Vorteil, so ist ewiger Friede gemacht.

2. Ich seh' es gern, das steht dir frei, nur daß die Kunst gefällig **sei**.

The first example is a condition without the normally present 'wenn' in the initial clause. The word order of the resultative clause is typical of an independent clause, proving that the clause "was originally independent, but has become logically subordinate."[33] The second example

---

[30] Curme, English Grammar 193.

[31] Curme, English Grammar 193.

[32] Curme, English Grammar 193.

[33] Curme, German Language 220.

expresses information that is true only if the conditional clause is true. The 'nur daß' provides the sentence with a conditional clause.

3.1.2.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, the present subjunctive I form of the verb is used in optative conditions, which is now considered to be archaic and restricted to set expressions in English and to older literature in German.

E: **Give** him an inch and he'll take a mile.

G: Bald, es **kenne** nur jeder den eigenen, **gönne** dem andern seinen Vorteil,
so ist ewiger Friede gemacht.

(b) In both languages, the 'if/wenn' is absent in the conditional clause and the present subjunctive I form of the verb takes over the role of creating the condition. With the 'if/wenn' not present, normal word order exists.

Contrasts

(a) In German, the present subjunctive I is used to follow 'nur daß' (translated as "but let it be, on the condition that"[34]), which in English is not the case.

(b) There is some doubt as to the subjunctive status of the English examples.

3.1.2.1.4. Subjunctive I in Final Clauses in English

In final clauses, the present subjunctive form of the verb is used in stating the result that will occur if the information in the preceding clause is true. The initial clause is condusive to a result given in a final clause that may become reality. The final clauses are often introduced by

---

[34] Curme, German Language 220.

such sentence structures as: 'in the hope that'; 'in order that'; 'so that'; or simply 'that'. The following serve as examples:

1. They crossed their fingers in the hope that he **be** chosen.
2. We left at 10 o'clock in order that we **be** early.
3. The tourniquet was applied so that the wound **stop** bleeding.
4. I left strict orders that he **take** the pills on a full stomach.

The examples given above of are of very high register. The general tendency in both written and spoken English is to use ***would*** or ***should + infinitive*** instead of the present subjunctive II form of the main verb. Consider the examples below:

5. They crossed their fingers in the hope that he **would** ***be*** chosen.
6. We left at 10 o'clock so that[35] we'**d** ***be*** early.
7. The tourniquet was applied so that the wound **would** ***stop*** bleeding.
8. They opened the window so that I **should** ***have*** some fresh air.[36]

It should also be noted that the time of action in each example is in the past and must be in the past in order for the following subjunctive I construction to be possible.

3.1.2.1.5. Subjunctive I in Final Clauses in German

The present subjunctive I is sometimes used in final clauses[37], although the indicative is preferred in colloquial German, leaving the subjunctive "restricted to formal (especially literary) German."[38] When the subjunctive is used, the final clauses are often introduced by 'damit'[39]

---

[35] When the present subjunctive II form of the verb is replaced by ***would + infinitive*** in a final clause introduced by 'in order that', there is a tendency to replace 'in order that' with 'so that', making the clause less wordy.

[36] There are dialectal differing preferences concerning the use of **should** as an alternative to **would** in the first persons.

[37] In final clauses introduced by 'damit' or an alternative, both present subjunctive I and II are acceptable without any change in meaning taking place. Durrell 323.

[38] Durrell 323.

("rarely, and frowned upon by grammarians: sodaß" [sic][40]). The more formal alternative 'auf daß' or the sentence fragment 'in der Hoffnung daß' may also begin a final clause. The facts preceding the final clause, on which it is dependent, have usually taken place in the past.[41] This may be due to the fact that the subjunctive is used more often in writing, which tends to employ the preterite. Consider the following examples:

1. Er gibt ihr sein Auto, damit sie nach Hause **fahre**.
2. Sie ißt ein Brötchen, damit sie später nicht hungrig **werde**.
3. Er ist mit dem Flugzeug geflogen, damit er den Termin nicht **versäume**.
4. Der Arzt gab ihm Riechsalz, auf daß er wieder zu sich **komme**.
5. Sie nahm eine Tablette in der Hoffnung, daß sie nicht krank **werde**.

Unlike in English, the time of action in these examples may be present or past and the present subjunctive I takes its time reference from the main verb.

In spoken German, these would be converted to indicatives (present or past according to context) or perhaps expanded by an auxiliary., e.g. <Er ist mit dem Flugzeug geflogen, damit er den Termin nicht *versäumte/**versäumen*** **würde**> or <Er ist mit dem Flugzeug geflogen, damit er früher hier ***sein*** **könnte**.>.

3.1.2.1.6. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, the subjunctive I is used in final clauses. Final clauses are often introduced by such sentence structures as: 'in the hope that'; 'in order that'; 'so that'; or simply 'that' in English or 'damit'; 'auf daß'; or 'in der Hoffnung daß' in German.

---

[39] Dora Schulz and Heinz Griesbach, Grammatik der deutschen Sprache, 8th ed. (München: Max Hueber, 1970) 52.

[40] Herbert L. Kufner, The Grammatical Structures of English and German. A Contrastive Sketch (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1962) 85.

[41] Schulz and Griesbach Grammatik 52.

(b) In conversation, both languages tend to replace subjunctive I with an indicative or expand it with an auxiliary.

Contrasts

(a) In English, the time of action must be in the past in order for the subjunctive I construction to follow logically. In German, the time reference of the subjunctive I depends on the tense of the main verb.

3.1.2.2. Noun Clauses

3.1.2.2.1. Subjunctive I of Wishing in English

Statements that express desired or planned results often have main verbs which imply "the expectation that the desire or plan will be realized."[42] The circumstance wished for is stated in the subordinate clause with the verb in its indicative or present subjunctive I form. In modern English, the indicative is often preferred to the subjunctive, but the subjunctive forms are still used in the spoken and written language. Consider the following examples:

1. I insist that it **be** so.
2. The teacher hopes that it **be** done.
3. They law requires that he **obey** the speed limit.
4. Her employer urged that she **be** punctual.
5. The policeman demands that he **go**.
6. They wished that he **speak** on behalf of everyone.
7. The cook suggests that he **eat** now.[43]
8. The doctor advises that she **take** two tablets a day.

---

[42] Curme, German Language 218.

[43] Certain verbs can introduce clauses with **should** + ***infinitive***. The **should** can be omitted and the infinitive then becomes a present subjunctive I verb form. Compare these sentences: <The cook suggests that he **should** ***eat*** now.> <The cook suggests that he **eat** now.> Thomson and Martinet 253.

9. He begged that she **do** it.

10. We asked that he **refrain** from smoking.

11. The president recommended that everyone **take** time off.

Desired actions can also be expressed with the main verb being in the imperative followed by a subjunctive verb form in the subordinate clause:

12. See to it that his homework **be** done.

Sometimes the idea of wish is not expressed through a verb, but rather a noun or an adjective followed by the present subjunctive I. The subjunctive in such wishes is frequently used in formal English. Consider the examples below:

13. It is my wish that **he** come.

14. His suggestion, that she **take** the bus, was a good one.

15. It is only appropriate that he **be** heard.

16. It is important that each child **learn** his/her address.

17. It is necessary that she **pass** this exam.

18. It is desirable that peace **prevail**.

19. It is vital that everyone **learn** CPR.

20. It is imperative that morale **remain** high.

21. It is essential that the Prime Minister **reduce** our national deficit.

22. It is advisable that she **seek** counseling.

23. It is urgent that she **read** this memo.

24. It is best that he **cancel** his plans for the weekend.

Conversationally, most of these verbs would be in the indicative.

3.1.2.2.2. Subjunctive I of Wishing in German

As in English, subordinating clauses in German, introduced by verbs expressing wishes, often contain subjunctive I verbs. Although the present subjunctive I can still be found in

written German, the indicative is generally preferred in the spoken language. Here are some examples of wishes employing the present subjunctive I:

1. Sie wünscht, daß er bald **gehe**.
2. Ich verlange, daß du den Brief **schreibest**.
3. Er bittet, daß sie länger **bleibe**.
4. Er hofft, daß es ihr **gelinge**.
5. Ich bestehe darauf, daß sie schon morgen **komme**.
6. Wir schlagen vor, daß er sie jetzt **bezahle**.
7. Ich ziehe vor, daß es jetzt fertig **werde**.
8. Er verdient, daß man ihm **glaube**.

Introductory clauses conveying wishes may also employ nouns or adjectives. The following serve as examples:

9. Ich habe Angst, daß er seinen Arbeitsplatz **verliere** / *verliert*.
10. Mach dir keine Hoffnung, daß er wieder gesund **werde** / *wird*.
11. Es ist ihr Ziel, daß sie dabei Erfolg **habe** / *hat*.
12. Ich gebe mich nicht der Hoffnung hin, daß sie **zurückkomme** / *zurückkommt*.
13. Es ist dringend, daß man mit ihm **rede** / *redet*.
14. Es ist wünschenswert, daß er mir seine ehrliche Meinung **sage** / *sagt*.

3.1.2.2.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, wishes can be expressed using the present subjunctive I. Clauses employing verbs, nouns and adjectives can be used to introduce the subordinate clause containing the present subjunctive I form of the verb, as the following examples show:

E: They wished that he **speak** on behalf of everyone.

G: Sie wünscht, daß er bald **gehe**.

E: His suggestion, that she **take** the bus, was a good one.

E: It is necessary that she **pass** this exam.

G: Es ist dringend, daß man mit ihm **rede**.

(b) Although the conversational preference in both languages is to replace the subjunctive with the indicative, the present subjunctive I verb forms are still frequently found in literature.

3.2. Potential Subjunctive I

The potential subjunctive of present subjunctive I forms "represents the statement as a mere conception, but yet as something which is quite probable, plausible, supposable, or as credible, but yet as only resting upon the testimony of others, or upon the subjective view of the speaker."[44]

The present subjunctive I can be found in adverb clauses expressing potential conditions and concessives as well as in noun clauses after verbs of fearing and doubting in both English and German. In English, the potential subjunctive I used in hypothetical situations following 'lest' will be examined. In German, the greatest use of the present subjunctive I is in indirect speech which, because of its importance in the German language, will also be considered briefly under noun clauses.

3.2.1. Subordinate Clauses

3.2.1.1. Adverb Clauses

3.2.1.1.1. Subjunctive I in Conditions in English

Potential conditions in English and German express states of affairs that have the possibility of becoming reality. In English, the clause employing the present subjunctive I verb form expresses the condition that will allow the following clause to be true. Such conditions can

---

[44] Curme, German Language 221.

be found in subjunctive I in poetry and set expressions of today. Even in high register, conditions employing present subjunctive I forms are infrequent:

1. If it **be** so, I can't go on.
2. If music **be** the food of love, play on.
3. If it **take** any longer, I will have to cancel my appointment.

The phrase 'if need **be**', employing the present subjunctive I and serving as an alternative to the phrase 'if it is necessary',[45] also expresses a condition which, if true, would require the following phrase to become reality. The following two sentences serve as examples:

4. If need **be**, I'll go.
5. If need **be**, the meeting can be postponed until next Friday.

The conjunction 'unless' is the equivalent of 'if' plus 'not' and may therefore, like 'if', be followed by a potential subjunctive I. Consider the example below:

6. Unless it **be** accepted, I shall resign.

(=If it is not accepted, I shall resign.)

or

(If it is accepted, I shall not resign.)

The use of the present subjunctive I following 'unless' is, however, infrequent and the indicative is preferred.

3.2.1.1.2. Subjunctive I in Conditions in German

The German clause 'es **sei** denn', has a conjunctional meaning 'unless' and employs the present subjunctive I form of the verb ***sein***[46]. The initial clause states what will be true unless

---

[45] Thomson and Martinet 253.

[46] The construction 'es **wäre** denn', employing the present subjunctive II form of the verb ***sein***, also exists, with the only difference being that 'es **sei** denn' expresses more assurance. Curme, German Language 224.

the second clause is realized. The two clauses are linked together by 'es **sei** denn' which may be followed by the subordinating conjunction 'daß', requiring the verb in the following clause to take final position.[47] When the 'daß' is omitted, the verb is in the usual second position. Although the construction used to be considered negative in meaning, today it is considered to be positive[48], unlike the English equivalent 'unless' and can still be found in older literature or elevated language. Consider the following examples:

1. Heute abend sehe ich fern, es **sei** denn, daß du mit mir essen gehst.

The negative formulation is as follows:

Heute abend sehe ich fern, wenn du nicht mit mir essen gehst.

or

Heute abend sehe ich nicht fern, wenn du mit mir essen gehst.

2. Ich fahre mit dem Bus, es **sei** denn, ich finde jemand, der mich mitnimmt.

The negative alternative is:

Ich fahre mit dem Bus, wenn ich nicht jemand finde, der mich mitnimmt.

or

Ich fahre nicht mit dem Bus, wenn ich jemand finde, der mich mitnimmt.

3.2.1.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, paraphrases for 'unless' / 'es **sei** denn' can be made with a negative in one clause or the other.

E: If he doesn't come home soon, I will have to leave without him.

E: If he comes home soon, I won't have to leave without him.

G: Ich fahre mit dem Bus, wenn ich nicht jemand finde, der mich mitnimmt.

---

[47] Durrell 321.

[48] Curme, German Language 223.

G: Ich fahre nicht mit dem Bus, wenn ich jemand finde, der mich mitnimmt.

Contrasts

(a) English uses subjunctive I in high register, whereas German does not.

E: If it **be** so, I can't go on.

G: Wenn es so *ist*, kann ich nicht weitergehen.

(b) In German, the present subjunctive I in potential conditions is restricted to the idiom 'es **sei** denn'. In English, there are in general no restrictions.

(c) With German 'es **sei** denn', the main clause comes first:

G: Ich fahre mit dem Bus, es sei denn, ich finde jemand, der mich mitnimmt.

With English 'unless', the order is optional:

E: Unless I **hear** by tomorrow, I will leave for Calgary.

or

E: I will leave for Calgary, unless I **hear** by tomorrow.

3.2.1.1.4. Subjunctive I in Concessives in English

When a situation is insisted upon, in spite of various adverse circumstances, the various circumstances or 'concessions' may be expressed in the subjunctive. The information in the main clause remains true in spite of a possible state of affairs described in the dependent clause. The speaker chooses the indicative in the main clause and thereby confirms certainty. The conceded circumstance is often expressed in an adverb clause with a subjunctive and the independent clause follows with the verb in the indicative. Consider the following examples:

1. **Be** that as it may, I still want to do it.
2. Whether it **be** from need or greed, it is still unforgivable.
3. **Be** he alive or **be** he dead, I'll grind his bones to make my bread.
4. Whatever it **cost**, I will make the sacrifice.
5. **Rain** or **shine**, we are going camping.

6. Though he **make** every effort, he cannot succeed.

7. **Come** hell or high water, she is going to go.

8. **Come** what may, he will go through with it.

The most frequently used verb in English concessives is the verb ***to be***. Concessives using the subjunctive, however, are on the decline. One tends to prefer the indicative over the subjunctive and sentences like <Whatever the cost, I will make the sacrifice.> are becoming more common and accepted.

Concessives with '(al)though', 'even if', 'even though' are not formulaic and less likely use the subjunctive I, but in high register it is not ruled out. Consider the following example:

9. Even though the journey **be** perilous, I will succeed.

3.2.1.1.5. Subjunctive I in Concessives in German

In German, subjunctive I forms are used in concessive clauses. As in English, a conceded action in German is often expressed in a subordinate clause with a subjunctive verb followed by an independent clause, which is grammatically independent but logically dependent. Grammatical independence is demonstrated by word order. Typically in German, when a subordinate clause precedes, the second clause must begin with the verb so that the first clause is embedded as the first element of the sentence. In concessives, however, the subject of the second clause is in first position and the verb is in second position. This word order "indicates clearly that the clause was originally an independent proposition. It has retained its original form, altho [sic] it has become logically subordinate."[49] Consider the following concessives:

1. **Sei** es auch noch so schön, ich werde es trotzdem verkaufen müssen.

2. **Sei** es, wie es **wolle**, die Aufgabe muß jetzt bewältigt werden.

---

[49] Curme, German Language 218.

3. **Seien** es aber Reden aus Eingebung, sie werden abgetan werden; **seien** es Zungenreden, sie werden aufhören; **sei** es Erkenntnis, sie wird abgetan werden.[50]

4. Es **komme**, was **wolle**, ich werde trotzdem morgen fahren.

5. Was er auch immer **wünsche**, nichts ist zu teuer.

The present subjunctive I as well as the indicative verb form of the modal verb ***mögen*** is also frequently used in concessives[51] as the following exemplifies:

6. Was immer geschehen **möge**, wir werden es schaffen.

7. **Möge** es noch so schütten, wir müssen ausladen.[52]

8. Was immer geschehen *mag*, wir sind vorbereitet.

Generally speaking, subjunctive I forms in concessives are considered to be archaic, with the exception of the verb ***sein*** in the set phrases: 'Wie dem auch **sei**'[53] or '**Sei** es so oder so...'. Consider the examples which follow:

9. Wie dem auch **sei**, ich werde das Risiko eingehen müssen.

10. **Sei** es so oder so, er muß trotzdem eine Entscheidung treffen.

Concessives with 'obwohl', 'obschon', 'auch wenn', 'wenn auch' are not subject to fossilization and do not take a subjunctive I verb, but rather the indicative, and the word order returns to verb first in the subordinate clause. The following sentence serves as an example:

11. Obwohl es viel *kostet*, wird er es kaufen.

---

[50] Die Heilige Schrift. Zwingli-Bibel. (Zürich: Zwingli, 1955) I Korintherbrief 13, 226.

[51] Schulz and Griesbach 51.

[52] Gerhard Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung." Zielsprache Deutsch 1 (1974) 2.

[53] Durrell 326.

3.2.1.1.6. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, particularly in fixed phrases, the present subjunctive I is used in concessives. In most cases the circumstance that is expressed in the subjunctive may or may not occur, but the clause that follows in the indicative is certain.

E: **Come** what may, he will succeed.

G: Es **komme**, was **wolle**, ich werde trotzdem morgen fahren.

(b) Unfossilized phrases tend to avoid the subjunctive I:

E: Even if she *comes* home now, she will be tired tomorrow.

G: Auch wenn er den billigeren Pulli *kauft*, hat er nicht genug Geld, die Hose zu kaufen.

(c) The present subjunctive I form of the verbs ***to be*** and ***sein*** are the most frequently used verbs in concessives in English and German respectively.

E: **Be** he alive or **be** he dead, I'll grind his bones to make my bread.

G: **Sei** es auch noch so schön, ich werde es trotzdem verkaufen müssen.

(d) In English and German concessives, the verb takes second position in the second clause.

E: **Come** what may, he will go through with it.

G: **Sei** es, wie es **wolle**, die Aufgabe muß jetzt bewältigt werden.

(e) The use of the present subjunctive I in concessives in English and German is declining and preference is being given to the indicative.

Contrasts

(a) In English, '(al)though', 'even if' and 'even though' may in high register take subjunctive I. In German, 'obwohl' / 'obschon', 'auch wenn', 'wenn auch' take only the indicative:

E: Even though the journey **be** perilous, I will succeed.

G: Obwohl es viel *kostet*, wird er es kaufen.

3.2.1.1.7. Subjunctive I in Hypothetical Situations in English

In English, the subordinating conjunction 'lest' is followed by a present subjunctive I verb. 'Lest' conveys the meaning of 'in case' or 'for fear that' and is used when precautions are to be taken because the hypothetical situation following 'lest' may in fact occur. Consider the following examples:

1. Lest we **forget**.
2. We should be quiet lest anyone **hear** us.
3. Laverne cleaned up her room lest her mother **see** the mess.

In German, there is nothing comparable employing the subjunctive.

3.2.1.2. Noun Clauses

3.2.1.2.1. Subjunctive I of Fearing and Doubting in English

The present subjunctive I can also occur after expressions of fear or doubt. These expressions are considered to be elevated in style and the indicative is usually preferred. Consider the following examples:

1. I fear it **be** true.
2. We doubt whether it **be** possible.

3.2.1.2.2. Subjunctive I of Fearing and Doubting in German

Fears and doubts can be expressed by using the appropriate verb in the introductory clause and the present subjunctive I verb form in the subordinate clause, just as is the case with wishes. The indicative is, however, preferred in spoken German. Consider the examples below:

1. Ich zweifle daran, daß sie pünktlich **komme** / *kommt*.
2. Er bezweifelt, daß sie das **tue** / *tut*.

3. Sie fürchtet, daß ihr Mitarbeiter sie **verrate** / *verrät*.

Fears and doubts may also be conveyed by using nouns as the following sentences exemplify. Again, the indicative tends to be preferred in spoken German:

4. Ich habe Angst, daß er seinen Arbeitsplatz **verliere** / *verliert*.

5. Mach dir keine Hoffnung, daß er wieder gesund **werde** / *wird*.

6. Ich gebe mich nicht der Hoffnung hin, daß sie **zurückkomme** / *zurückkommt*.

3.2.1.2.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, fears and doubts can be expressed using the present subjunctive I:

E: I fear it **be** true.

G: Ich zweifle daran, daß sie pünktlich **komme**.

(b) The indicative is preferred in clauses of fearing and doubting in both languages.

3.2.1.2.4. Subjunctive I of Indirect Speech in German

The most prominent use of the present subjunctive I in German is in reported speech. In such instances, one party relays the utterance of a third party to a second party. The introductory clause lets the hearer know that the following statement is that of a third party, and the present subjunctive I form of the verb confirms that the information is a report. By using the present subjunctive I, the person reporting maintains an impartial attitude to what is being reported; the speaker can, however, express doubt about the factuality or accuracy of the report through the context.[54]

In English, the reader is conscious of the fact that the statement is indirect speech because of the verb of saying introducing the second clause, the conjunction 'that' which may

---

[54] Günter Schade, Einführung in die deutsche Sprache der Wissenschaften. Ein Lehrbuch für Ausländer. 9th ed. (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1985) 196.

link the two clauses together, and the shift in tense that the verb in the second clause may undergo. In German, there are similar characteristics; a verb introduces the second clause, the conjunction 'daß' usually joins the two clauses, but instead of a change in the tense of the verb, there is a change in mood. In German, the present subjunctive I verb form is used in the second clause, instead of the indicative, to make the reader aware that the statement is indeed that of another, and is simply being relayed.

In indirect speech in English, we are dealing with two time relationships. The first is between the obligatory present in which all utterances are made (t_s), and the time of the event described in the utterance (t_e). This relationship is one of simultaneity or (normally) anteriority of t_e. The second relationship is between the tense of the verb of saying (t'_s) and the tense of the reported event (t'_e). The first relationship has to be the same type (simultaneity or anteriority) as the second relationship, such that: $[t_s : t_e] = [t'_s : t'_e]$.

English Direct Speech		English Indirect Speech	
t_s	t_e	t'_s	t'_e

[(Pres.) = "Jo is working."] = [Jane says = that Jo is working.]

[(Pres.) ≠ "Jo was working."] = [Jane says ≠ that Jo was working.]

[(Pres.) = "Jo is working."] = [Jane said = that Jo was working. (if Jo is no longer working)]

[(Pres.) ≠ "Jo was working."] = [Jane said ≠ that Jo had been working.]

The tense relationship in the indirect speech construction reiterates the relationship observed between the obligatory present time of the utterance and the time of the event described in the utterance. Now let us consider examples of German indirect speech:

German Direct Speech		German Indirect Speech
(a) Present Tense		(b) Present Subjunctive I / II
"Ich komme spätestens am Mittwoch."	=	Isabell sagt/sagte, sie **komme/käme** spätestens am Mittwoch.

(c) Past Tenses		(d) Past Subjunctive I / II
"Ich bin spätestens am Mittwoch gekommen."		Isabell sagt/sagte, sie **sei/wäre**
"Ich kam spätestens am Mittwoch."	=	spätestens am Mittwoch gekommen.

The principle of German indirect speech is that the present tense of the direct speech must be reflected in a present subjunctive I or II of the indirect speech, while any past tense of the direct speech must be reflected by a past subjunctive I or II in the indirect speech. The examples show that German is indifferent to the tense of the verb of saying, whereas English has the sequence of tenses rule.[55]

In written German, the present subjunctive I is generally used in indirect speech[56] with the exception of when the present subjunctive I form is identical to that of the indicative, in which case the present subjunctive II is used.[57] The following serve as examples:

9. Dagmar sagte, sie **hätten** keine Lust, ins Kino mitzugehen.

(rather than)

10. Dagmar sagte, sie **haben** keine Lust, ins Kino mitzugehen.

---

[55] The sequence of tenses rule: "When the main verb of a sentence is in a past tense, verbs in subordinate clauses are normally in a past tense also." Thomson and Martinet 195.

[56] If imperatives are expressed in indirect speech, they are usually paraphrased with subj. I/II **sollen** + ***infinitive***., e.g., <Der Lehrer sagte, "Mach für morgen früh diese Aufgabe."> <Der Lehrer sagte, daß der Schüler diese Aufgabe für morgen früh ***machen*** **solle**.>.

[57] Schulz and Griesbach 55.

4. USES OF THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE II

In an attempt to understand the uses of the present subjunctive II, let us first consider the definition Curme put forth while discussing the present subjunctive II in German, which also applies to English:

> "The subjunctive of past tense forms is used to represent that which is wished for without much hope of realization, also that which is conceived as quite doubtful, contrary to fact, or that which merely exists in the imagination, or rests upon appearances without foundation in facts."[58]

In this chapter we will be dealing with the present subjunctive II in English and German. In both languages it is used to express that which is 'unreal'. It can be something that has not yet been realized but still lies within the boundaries of possible occurrences[59] (e.g., That **would** ***be*** good. / Das **wäre** gut.) or something that has absolutely no chance of becoming true (e.g., If only I **had** wings! / Wenn ich nur Flügel **hätte**!). For our purposes, the unreal present subjunctive II will be divided into two categories: the 'unreal optative' and the 'unreal potential'. The 'unreal optative' is used in expressing a desired action, which although wished for, has little if any chance of being realized. (e.g., If only I **could** ***get*** another five dollars.) In instances where an implied condition, rather than a wish, is being expressed, the 'unreal potential' is employed (e.g., Das **wäre** nett.). Whether the contents of the wish or statement are within the realms of reality is not important in the categorization (e.g., If pigs **could** ***fly***....). Grammatically, there is no difference in the structure of the sentence. It is the situation which determines whether the statement or wish is possible or not. The fact that the wishes or utterances are at the time of speech felt to be 'unreal' makes the use of the present subjunctive II mandatory. The subjunctive II in polite requests and statements is a special case and is discussed under the heading 'potential'. When a polite request is made using the present subjunctive II, there is still belief that the request will be fulfilled. The subjunctive II simply gives the other

---

[58] Curme, German Language 227.

[59] Schade 208.

party the option to fulfill the request or not. Since the hearer has a choice, the request seems more polite and less direct.

The present subjunctive II is used more frequently than present subjunctive I in both the colloquial and written language of English and German. Despite the fact that it is based on the past indicative form of the verb, it is used strictly in expressing present or future time, hence its name 'present subjunctive II'.

4.1. Unreal Optative Subjunctive II

As seen in the previous chapter, the optative present subjunctive I reveals that the wish has a chance of becoming realized. (e.g., G: So **sei** es!) The unreal optative subjunctive, however, serves a different function. By employing present subjunctive II, the unreal optative subjunctive expresses desires which have questionable, little or no chance of being or becoming true.[60] (e.g., G: Wenn ich nur fliegen **könnte**!)

The unreal optative is divided up into two sections; independent and subordinate clauses, where the present subjunctive II in unreal wishes in English and German will be discussed.

4.1.1. Independent Clauses

4.1.1.1. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in English

Unreal wishes can be expressed by using present subjunctive II verb forms introduced by 'if'. In order for unreal wishes in English to exist as independent clauses introduced by 'if', the adverbial particle 'only' must be present. Without 'only' the clause is dependent and requires an additional clause to make the statement complete. Consider the following examples:

1. If only I **had** enough money! (≠If I had enough money....)
2. If only he **had** a car!
3. If only they **were** here!

---

[60] Curme, German Language 216.

4. If only she **were** healthy again!

In archaic constructions expressing unreal wishes, the present subjunctive II of the main verbs ***to be*** and ***to have*** and modal verbs ***can***, ***may*** and ***will*** may begin the wish[61] and the subject occupies the second position. In order for an unreal wish using **be**, **have**, **could**, **might** or **would** to be independent, an adverbial particle must be present. Without it, the utterance becomes a subordinate clause. Consider the following examples:

5. **Had** I but more time! (≠ Had I more time,....)

6. **Were** I only 20 years younger!

7. **Could** I but change the past!

8. **Would** he but concentrate!

9. **Might** I but take one last look!

Another archaic manner of expressing unreal wishes in English is to use 'oh that' followed by the present subjunctive II form of the verb following the subject. Such wishes avoid the adverbial particle 'but' because they are not necessary to make the statement independent. The following serve as examples:

10. Oh that he **were** alive again!

11. Oh that she **were** healthy again!

12. Oh that they **were** here!

13. Oh that I **had** enough money!

14. Oh that he **had** more time!

15. Oh that she **had** her children once again!

In English, the verbs ***to have*** and ***to be*** may be used in initial position to replace 'if' or 'oh that'. If the present subjunctive II forms of other verbs are employed, 'if' or 'oh that' must be used. The following serve as examples:

16. If I only **knew**! (not: *Knew I only!)

---

[61] Curme, English Grammar 237.

17. Oh that she **took** more care! (not: *Took she only more care!)

Rather than using the present subjunctive II in unreal wishes, there is often a tendency to use **would** + ***infinitive*** of the original main verb.[62] The following serve as examples:

18. If I **would** only ***know***!

19. If she **would** only ***take*** more care!

20. Oh that she **would** ***be*** healthy again!

4.1.1.2. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in German

The optative subjunctive employing present subjunctive II in independent clauses is used in German, as in English, to express wishes that scarcely have the chance of becoming reality. In German literature, it is common for the present subjunctive II to be in first position in the unreal wish.[63] Although the present subjunctive II is found in first position, indicating subordinate status, these unreal wishes are indeed logically independent.[64] In such wishes, particles such as 'nur', 'doch' or 'aber doch' are used in conjunction with the subjunctive to stress the status as a wish and make it an independent clause.[65] Unreal wishes may begin with the verb, as in the examples below:

1. **Wäre** ich nur fertig!

2. **Wären** wir nur da!

---

[62] The use of the **would** + ***infinitive*** is common, not only in unreal wishes, but in virtually all uses of the present subjunctive II.

[63] Lutz Götze and Ernst W. B. Hess-Lüttich, Knaurs Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. Sprachsystem und Sprachgebrauch (München: Lexikographisches Institut, 1989) 108.

[64] It is also stated that 'unreal wishes' (irreale Wunschsätze) are caught between the categories of 'main clause' (Hauptsatz) and 'elliptical subordinate clause' (elliptischer Nebensatz). Drosdowski et al., eds., Grammatik 160. Götze and Hess-Lüttich 108.

[65] A wish is an independent expression, not requiring a grammatical attachment of any kind. The unreal wish <If only I had your opportunities!> does not need a grammatical continuation even though the way in which the speaker would use the opportunities could be detailed.

3. **Hätte** er doch noch sein Kind!
4. **Hätte** ich aber doch mehr Zeit!
5. **Käme** sie doch nach Hause!
6. **Wüßte** er das nur!

The majority of such unreal wishes, as shown above, have the present subjunctive II form of the verbs ***sein*** or ***haben*** acting as the main verb. Although the construction is not limited to these two verbs, the frequency of other verbs appearing in such a construction is quite low. Other verbs tend to use **würde** + ***infinitive***.

More frequently used to introduce unreal wishes in independent clauses are the conjunctions 'wenn' or 'O daß',[66] which require the present subjunctive II verb form to be in final position. Although such a subordinating conjunction usually introduces a dependent clause, which is then followed by an independent clause, a similar initial clause with 'nur' etc. expressing an unreal wish can stand alone with no additional clause. Consider the following examples:

7. Wenn ich nur fertig **wäre**! (≠Wenn ich fertig **wäre**,...)
8. O daß wir nur da **wären**!
9. Wenn er doch noch sein Kind **hätte**!
10. O daß ich morgen nur mehr Zeit **hätte**!
11. O daß sie doch nach Hause **käme**!
12. Wenn er das nur **wüßte**!

Subjunctive forms of modal verbs such as ***wollen***, ***mögen***, ***können*** and ***dürfen*** + ***infinitive*** can also be used to express unreal wishes.[67] Consider the following examples:

13. **Wollte** er das Projekt nur ***unternehmen***!
14. Wenn er nur das Projekt ***unternehmen*** **wollte**!
15. **Möchte** sie das nur!

---

[66] Curme, German Language 228.

[67] Curme, German Language 228.

16. O daß sie das **möchte**!

17. **Könnte** ich nur nach Hause ***gehen***!

18. Wenn ich nur nach Hause ***gehen*** **könnte**!

19. **Dürfte** ich nur noch einmal ***wiederkehren***!

20. Wenn ich nur noch einmal ***wiederkehren*** **dürfte**!

Parallel to **would** + ***infinitive*** English, the present subjunctive II in German wishes is often replaced with the **würde** + ***infinitive*** construction. When the main verbs are either ***sein*** or ***haben***, however, the present subjunctive II is preferred. Here are some examples:

21. Wenn sie nur nach Hause ***kommen*** **würden**!

22. O daß es nicht ***regnen*** **würde**!

23. Wenn er nur ***essen*** **würde**!

24. O daß sie nur ***mitspielen*** **würden**!

25. **Wäre** ich nur jünger!

26. **Hätte** ich doch meinen Regenschirm!

27. **Würde** es aber morgen ***regnen***!

4.1.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, unreal wishes in independent clauses require the present subjunctive II.

E: If I only **had** enough money!

G: Wenn ich nur fertig **wäre**!

(b) In both languages, unreal wishes may begin with the present subjunctive II form of a verb or a subordinating conjunction.

E: **Were** I only as lucky as you!

E: If I only **knew**!

E: Oh that he **were** alive again!

G: **Käme** sie doch nach Hause!

G: Wenn er das nur **wüßte**!

G: O daß sie doch nach Hause **käme**!

(c) In English and German, the present subjunctive II of ***will*** or ***werden***, respectively, + ***infinitive*** may replace the original present subjunctive II verb form to express the same unreal wish.

E: If only you **would** ***listen***!

(= If only you **listened**!)

G: Wenn du nur ***zuhören*** **würdest**!

(=Wenn du nur **zuhörtest**!)

(d) Similar constructions are also common with the present subjunctive II of English ***can*** and ***may***, and German ***wollen***, ***mögen***, and ***können*** + ***infinitive***. In both languages, the modals take first position:

E: **Could** I ***be*** but 20 years younger!

E: **Might** I but ***see*** it once more!

G: **Wollte** er das Projekt nur ***unternehmen***!

G: **Möchte** sie nur ***mitkommen***!

G: **Könnte** ich nur nach Hause ***gehen***!

G: **Dürfte** ich nur noch einmal ***wiederkehren***!

G: Wenn ich nur noch einmal ***wiederkehren*** **dürfte**!

(e) In German an adverbial particle such as 'nur' 'doch' or 'aber doch' is necessary to make the unreal wish an independent clause. In current English the parallel is true, with such adverbial particles as 'only' or 'but' being used to make the unreal wish independent.

G: **Wäre** ich nur fertig!

G: **Käme** sie doch nach Hause!

G: **Hätte** ich aber doch mehr Zeit!

E: **Had** I but more time!

E: If only they **were** here!

Contrasts

(a) In English, the present subjunctive II forms only of the modal verbs ***can***, ***may*** and ***will*** as well as the verbs ***to be*** and ***to have*** may begin an unreal wish. In German, the present subjunctive II forms of any verb may begin the wish:

E: **Could** I but change the past!

E: **Might** I but take one last look!

E: **Would** he but concentrate!

E: **Were** I only 20 years younger!

E: **Had** I but more time!

G: **Gäbe** er nur sein Wort dazu!

G: **Stünde** doch der Bösewicht nur vor mir!

G: **Käme** sie doch nach Hause!

G: **Wüßte** er das nur! (not * Knew he only that!)

4.1.2. Subordinate Clauses

4.1.2.1. Noun Clauses

4.1.2.1.1. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in English

Unreal wishes employing present subjunctive II express desires which have little chance of becoming true, but are nevertheless wished for inwardly.[68] Such wishes are created with the present subjunctive II forms of the verbs. Consider the following examples:

1. He wished that she **were** here.
2. I wish I **were** you.[69]

---

[68] Curme, German Language 229.

3. I wish John **were** studying now.[70]

4. He wishes that he **had** a car.

5. I wish I **had** your hair.

The above are examples of unreal wishes using the present subjunctive II of the verbs ***to be*** and ***to have***. The present subjunctive II of other verbs is also employed in conveying unreal wishes, but when they are used in conjunction with 'that', there is sometimes a tendency to use the replacement form **would** + ***infinitive***. The choice is, however, left up to the speaker or writer. Consider the following examples:

6. I wish you **played** with the children.

7. I wish that you **would** play with the children.

8. She wishes he **came** on time.

9. She wishes that he **would** ***come*** on time.

Unreal wishes are also expressed by using present subjunctive II form of the modal verb ***can*** + ***infinitive***. Consider the following examples:

10. I wish that you **could** go with me.

11. I wish he **could** spend more time with me.

4.1.2.1.2. Subjunctive II in Unreal Wishes in German

Just as in English, unreal wishes in German are expressed using present subjunctive II forms. The present subjunctive II forms of the main verbs ***sein*** and ***haben*** are very common in the dependent clauses of unreal wishes. The subordinating conjunction 'daß' can be used to link the two clauses, in which case the verb takes final position. The following serve as examples:

1. Ich wünschte, sie **wäre** hier.

---

[69] In colloquial English it is common to hear 'I wished I **were** you.' instead of 'I wish I were you.'. In this particular instance, the old present subjunctive II form 'wished' has not been replaced by the **would** + ***infinitive*** construction, so common in the English language of today.

[70] Linda A. Ferreira, Verbs in Action (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978) 135.

2. Sie wollte, daß es anders **wäre**.

3. Wir wünschten, wir **hätten** mehr Zeit.

4. Ich wollte, daß ich mehr Geld **hätte**.

Popular present subjunctive II forms such as **täte**, **käme** and **ginge** are also frequently used, but when other verbs (besides ***sein*** and ***haben***) are employed in the subordinate clause to express an unreal wish, the replacement form **würde** + ***infinitive*** is normally used. Consider the following examples:

5. Sie wünschten, sie **täte** das woanders.

6. Sie wünschten, sie **würde** das woanders ***tun***.

7. Er wollte, daß sie bald **kämen**.

8. Er wollte, daß sie bald ***kommen*** **würden**.

9. Wir wünschten, er **ginge** nicht allein.

10. Wir wünschten, er **würde** nicht allein ***gehen***.

The present subjunctive II of modal verbs ***können***, ***dürfen***, ***wollen*** and in rare cases ***müssen*** + ***infinitive*** can also be used in a subordinate clause to express an unreal wish. Consider the following examples:

11. Ich wünschte, ich **könnte** das Auto kaufen.

12. Die Kinder wollten, daß sie mitkommen **dürften**.

13. Der Mann wünschte, sein Sohn **wollte** ihm helfen.

14. Die Lehrerin wollte, daß er kommen **müßte**.

4.1.2.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, the present subjunctive II is used to convey an unreal wish in a noun clause:

E: I wish I **were** you.

E: I wish I **had** your hair.

G: Ich wünschte, sie **wäre** hier.

G: Wir wünschten, wir **hätten** mehr Zeit.

(b) In both languages, the present subjunctive II forms of verbs other than ***to be/sein*** and ***to have/haben*** can be used in unreal wishes. When such verbs are employed, **would / würde** + ***infinitive*** tend to serve as a replacement form for the subjunctive.

E: I wish you **took** more care.

E: I wish you **would** ***take*** more care.

G: Er wollte, daß sie bald **kämen**.

G: Er wollte, daß sie bald ***kommen*** **würden**.

(c) Certain modal verbs in English and German can be used in unreal wishes and are scarcely replaceable with **would / würde** + ***infinitive***.

E: I wish I could fly.

(not *I wish I would be able to fly.)

G: Ich wünschte, ich könnte fliegen.

(not *Ich wünschte, ich würde fliegen können.)

4.2. Potential Subjunctive II

The potential subjunctive II serves numerous similar functions in English and German. In independent clauses, the present subjunctive II is employed in implied conditions, polite requests and statements and unreal conditions. In adverb clauses, unreal conditions, concessives, and false comparisons can be expressed using potential subjunctive II forms. English and German potential subjunctive II forms are also employed in noun clauses conveying hypothetical situations. In German, there are two additional applications in noun clauses which will be examined briefly, namely the potential subjunctive II of exception and unfulfilled expectation, and in indirect speech.

4.2.1. Independent Clauses

4.2.1.1. Subjunctive II in Implied Conditions in English

In statements where "the addition of a condition is implied [...]" the present subjunctive II is used because "if the condition were fulfilled, the action would take place."[71] Such statements must have a modal + ***infinitive***, assuming that **would** is also modal. Implied conditions using **would** are frequently created in modern English. The following statements with their respective possible implied conditions serve as examples:

1. I **could** help you. (if you were willing to take my advice.)
2. It **might** be better. (if I got out here.)
3. It **would** be nice. (if we could go together.)
4. **Would** that be satisfactory? (if I would prepare the presentation for tomorrow?)
5. He **would** then be comfortable. (if we bought him this armchair.)
6. I **would** gladly help you. (if it were in my power.)[72]

The following implied condition is an idiom with a fossilized subjunctive II:

7. She **had** better go now. (if she wants to get there on time.)

4.2.1.2. Subjunctive II in Implied Conditions in German

The present subjunctive II is used in statements in which a condition is implied by the speaker. The condition has not yet been fulfilled and, as a result, the present subjunctive II is required in the independent clause. Although the present subjunctive II form of the verb ***sein*** is often used in such sentences implying conditions, other verbs are also quite common. Possible implied conditions have been listed in brackets in the following examples:

---

[71] Irina B. Khlebnikova, The Conjunctive Mood in English (The Hague: Mouton, 1976) 45.

[72] Khlebnikova 45.

1. Wer **wäre** der Schuldige? (wenn deine Vermutung zutreffen sollte?)[73]

2. Das **wäre** doch besser! (wenn du die Möglichkeit hättest, so zu handeln!)[74]

3. Das **wäre** im Kaufhof zu bekommen. (wenn du es kaufen willst.)

4. Das **wäre** schrecklich. (wenn er betrunken nach Hause käme.)

5. Es **wäre** mir lieber. (wenn sie hier bleiben würde.)

6. Damit **wären** wir quitt. (wenn Sie mir 20 Mark gäben.)

7. Durst **hätte** ich schon! (wenn du mir etwas anbieten könntest!)

8. Ich **müßte** eigentlich teilnehmen. (wenn ich das Spiel richtig verstehen will.)

9. Das **dürfte** richtig sein. (wenn wir diese Umstände betrachten.)

10. Er **sollte** das Geld zurückzahlen. (wenn ich die Sache richtig beurteile.)

11. Ich **sollte** jetzt gehen. (wenn ich rechtzeitig da sein möchte.)

12. Ich **wüßte** schon, was zu tun wäre. (wenn unsere Pläne uns nicht gelingen.)

13. Ich **bräuchte** mehr Milch. (wenn ich diesen Kuchen backen wollte.)

14. Ich **ginge** gleich morgen. (wenn ich an seiner Stelle wäre.)

15. Was **tätest** du mit zehn Mark? (wenn ich sie dir geben würde?)

16. **Führe** sie jeden Tag zur Arbeit? (wenn sie ein Auto hätte?)

The tendency to use **würde** + ***infinitive*** is growing and therefore the present subjunctive II is being used less and less:

17. Sie **würde** deine Arbeit loben.[75] (wenn sie hier wäre.)

---

[73] Emanuel Röhrl, "Der Konjunktiv im heutigen Sprachgebrauch." Muttersprache 10 (1962) : 290.

[74] Röhrl 290.

[75] Drosdowski et al., eds., Grammatik 158.

18. Das **würde** einen schlechten Eindruck machen. (wenn Sie sich so verhalten würden.)

19. **Würde** sie diese Straße nicht mehr fahren?[76] (wenn sie die Wahl hätte?)

In some cases, the condition is transformed into a matter of judgement of circumstances as shown in the examples below:

20. Das **dürfte** richtig sein. (unter diesen Umständen.)

21. Ich **ginge** gleich morgen. (an deiner Stelle.)

22. Das **sollte** nicht sein. (meiner Meinung nach.)

4.2.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, the present conditional is used to express implied conditions:

E: It **would** be nice.

G: Das **würde** mich zufriedenstellen.

(b) In both languages, the present subjunctive II of modals + ***infinitive*** is used in implied conditions:

E: That **could**n't ***do*** any harm = G: Das **könnte** nicht ***schaden***.

E: That **might** ***be*** better. = G: Das **dürfte** besser ***sein***.

Contrasts

(a) In English, the present subjunctive II verbs employed in expressing implied conditions are limited to modals **could** and **might** + ***infinitive***. In the German language of today, because the subjunctive system is more fully and consistently developed, implied conditions are still freely created with a variety of main verbs in the present subjunctive II.

---

[76] Götze and Hess-Lüttich 108.

G: Ich **wüßte** schon, was zu tun wäre. (wenn unsere Pläne uns nicht gelingen.) = E: I **would** ***know*** what to do. (if our plans fell through.)

G: Ich **bräuchte** mehr Milch. (wenn ich diesen Kuchen backen wollte.) =

E: I **would** ***need*** more milk. (if I wanted to bake this cake.)

4.2.1.4. Subjunctive II in Polite Requests and Statements in English

In higher register, requests are often expressed using the present subjunctive II forms of modal verbs ***can***, ***may***, ***shall*** and ***will*** as opposed to the indicative verb forms. In doing so, the sentences that may take the form of questions have the illocutionary force of requests. Here are some examples of polite requests in the grammatical form of questions using modal + ***infinitive*** constructions:

1. **Could** you please ***shut*** the door?
2. **Could** you ***send*** him in please?
3. **Might** it not ***be*** better to think about what I've said?
4. **Might** you ***consider*** my offer?

Historically replacing the present subjunctive II, the conditional (**would** + ***infinitive***) is the basic construction:

5. **Would** you please ***come*** in?
6. **Would** you ***call*** back later please?
7. **Would** you ***be*** so kind as to mention my name?

All of the above request-questions are expressed with politeness through the use of the unreality of the present subjunctive II. These requests may be compared to implied conditions discussed in the preceding section. The speaker makes a request giving the other party a choice to fulfill the request or not. The following requests have possible implied conditions given in brackets:

8. **Could** you please ***shut*** the door? (if you wouldn't mind?)
9. **Might** you ***consider*** my offer? (if it is satisfactory?)

10. **Would** you ***call*** back later please? (if you have the time?)

Desired actions, expressed as statements, can be implied simply by using present subjunctive II forms of modal verbs in conjunction with an infinitive. Such requests are conveyed in a very subtle manner, as the following examples show:

11. You **might** ***be*** of assistance.

12. You **would** ***help*** me in this way.

13. John, we **could** ***use*** some more eggs.

In making use of the purely potential subjunctive, sometimes the speaker expresses a wish in the form of a suggestion or comment, with a high degree of politeness. Here again a modal or **would** + ***infinitive*** construction is used. Consider the following statements:

14. That **might** not ***be*** such a good idea.

15. That **would** ***be*** all for today.

In archaic English, polite unreal wishes often employ **would** + ***infinitive*** instead of 'I wish' as the following wish exemplifies:

16. **Would** that you ***were*** with me!

4.2.1.5. Subjunctive II in Polite Requests and Statements in German

In German, as in English, the present subjunctive II is often used to express a request with stressed politeness and caution.[77] Since the degree of politeness is often indicative of the register, it is quite common to use present subjunctive II verb forms with formal addresses, although it is also used in informal circumstances simply to show politeness and respect.

As in English, German requests in the form of questions employing the present subjunctive II may be compared to implied conditions, since the fulfilling of the request depends

---

[77] Schade notes that "[b]esonders stark ist hier die Vergangenheit, die ja eigentlich die Erfüllung der Bitte als unmöglich darstellt, so daß der Angesprochene nun nachdrücklich aufgefordert ist, zu zeigen, daß noch eine Möglichkeit der Verwirklichung besteht: <Ich hätte gern Herrn Prof. Schulz gesprochen.>." Schade 210.

on an implied condition. Consider the following examples which have possible implied conditions:

1. **Könnten** Sie das Fenster zumachen bitte? (wenn es Ihnen nichts ausmacht?)
2. **Könntest** du mir bitte einen Gefallen tun?

In addition to ***könnten***, the present subjunctive II of the modal verbs, ***mögen***, ***sollen***, ***dürfen***, ***wollen*** and the main verbs ***werden***, ***sein*** and ***haben*** are often used in making polite requests:

3. **Möchten** Sie bitte hereinkommen?
4. **Solltest** du das machen?
5. **Dürfte** ich mich hier hinsetzen?
6. **Wollten** wir schon losfahren?

In instances where the present subjunctive II is identical in form with the past indicative, the **würde** + ***infinitive*** construction is used:

7. **Würden** Sie mir bitte Bescheid ***sagen***?
8. **Würdest** du das dir bitte ***überlegen***?

Popular subjunctive II forms of such verbs as ***kommen***, ***gehen***, and ***tun*** are also used in creating polite requests. The present subjunctive II of other verbs can be used but then the tendency is to use the indicative verb forms. Consider the following examples:

9. **Kämen** Sie mit, um mir zu helfen?
10. **Gingest** du mir zuliebe nicht allein dahin?
11. **Täten** Sie das für mich?

As in English, statements in German can imply polite requests or convey suggestions by using the optative subjunctive if the context is suitable. The following serve as examples:

12. Udo, wir **bräuchten** mehr Milch.
13. Wir **hätten** gern die Rechnung.
14. Du **könntest** mir dabei ***helfen***.
15. Wir **könnten** das Essen jetzt ***zubereiten***.

16. Ich **könnte** deine Arbeit ***fertigbringen***.

As in English, statements can employ the present subjunctive II in German when the speaker wishes to make a polite impression. The following examples are of a purely potential nature as if the speaker were making the statement conditional on the interlocutor's consent. Consider the following examples:

17. Das **wäre** Ihr Wechselgeld. (wenn es Ihnen recht ist.)

18. Das **wäre** alles. (wenn ich nichts mehr will.)

19. Da **wären** wir also. (wenn Sie nirgendwoanders hingehen wollten.)

20. Damit **kämen** wir zu Ende. (wenn das Ihnen paßt.)

Questions can also be asked in a very polite manner using the present subjunctive II as the following questions exemplify:

21. **Möchtest** du mitkommen?

22. **Müßten** wir die Aufgabe abgeben?

23. **Wollten** Sie mit ins Kino gehen?

24. **Wäre** das alles?

25. **Hätten** Sie noch einen Wunsch?

With the use of the present subjunctive II forms of ***wünschen*** and ***wollen*** in the introductory clauses, the unreal wishes are conveyed with politeness, as if the speaker were making the expression of the wish dependent on the hearer's agreement or on the appropriateness of the wish in the given situation. The directness of the wish is thereby toned down. The following serve as examples:

26. Ich **wünschte**, sie wäre hier.

27. Ich **wollte**, es wäre anders.

28. Ich **wünschte**, er wäre gesund.

4.2.1.6. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In both English and German, requests and statements are conveyed with a higher degree of politeness when the present subjunctive II rather than the indicative verb forms are employed.

E: **Could** you please shut the door?

E: *Can* you please shut the door?

G: **Könnten** Sie das Fenster zumachen?

G: *Können* Sie das Fenster zumachen?

(b) In both languages, auxiliary verbs are used in expressing polite requests.

E: **Would** you please come in?

G: **Würden** Sie bitte hereinkommen?

(c) In polite statements implying a request, the present subjunctive II forms of modal verbs and select main verbs may be used in English as well as German.

E: You **might** be of assistance.

G: Du **könntest** mir dabei helfen.

(d) Archaic English '**would** that' is parallel to German 'ich **wollte**, daß' and English substandard '**I wished**' is parallel to 'ich **wünschte**, daß' in the main clause introducing an unreal wish:

E: **Would** that you ***were*** with me!

G: Ich **wollte**, es wäre anders.

E: I **wished** I were you.

G: Ich **wünschte**, sie wäre hier.

Contrasts

(a) In German not only modals but also the subjunctive II forms of main verbs are frequently used to express politeness in a wish or request. This is not possible in English since ***have*** and ***be*** can only be used as infinitives with the modal carrying the subjunctive meaning of politeness. Compare the following examples:

E: **Would** that ***be*** everything?

G: **Wäre** das alles?

E: **Would** you ***have*** time for me?

G: **Hättest** du Zeit für mich?

4.2.1.7. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in English

In clauses stating unreal conditions, the present subjunctive II is used, thereby stressing the 'unrealness' of the utterance. In English, when using any main verb in a main clause of unreal condition, it must be in a **would** + ***infinitive*** construction as seen in the examples that follow:

1. If I were you, I **would** ***leave*** tomorrow.
2. If she came now, she **would** ***ruin*** the surprise.
3. If he saw anything, he **would** ***scream***.
4. If I failed the exam, I **would** ***cry***.

The present subjunctive II modal verb forms **could**, **might**, and **should** + ***infinitive*** are used in main clauses of unreal conditions. Consider the examples below:

5. If he got another job now, he **could** ***go*** away for Christmas.
6. If she caught a cold, she **could**n't ***go*** camping on the weekend.
7. If he went to Calgary, he **might** ***pick*** it up for us.
8. If she knew about the trip, she **might** ***go*** with them.
9. If you went out alone, you **should** ***take*** more care.
10. If I went to the park, I **should** ***see*** the new fountain.

4.2.1.8. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in German

The present subjunctive II is used in the main clauses of unreal conditions. Consider the examples below:

1. Wenn ich abends in die Kneipe ginge, **sänge** ich nicht.

2. Wenn Barbara allein zu Hause wäre, **schliefe** sie den ganzen Tag.

Although the present subjunctive II is usually used in the 'wenn-clause' of an unreal condition in German, there is a definite tendency to use the **würde** + ***infinitive*** construction in the resulting clause. Exceptions are made when the main verb is a ***sein***, ***haben*** or a modal in which case the present subjunctive II forms are almost always preferred. Consider the following examples:

3. Wenn ich abends in die Kneipe ginge, **würde** ich nicht ***singen***.

rather than

4. Wenn ich abends in die Kneipe ginge, **sänge** ich nicht.

but

5. Ich **wäre** glücklich, wenn sie jetzt käme.

rather than

6. Ich **würde** glücklich ***sein***, wenn sie jetzt käme.

7. Ich **könnte** ***kommen***, wenn ich Geld hätte.

rather than

8. Ich **würde** ***kommen können***, wenn ich Geld hätte.

There is a slight difference in meaning between a sentence that employs the subjunctive II form of the main verb and one that uses the **würde** + ***infinitive*** construction. The subjunctive II in conditional clauses stresses the 'Nichtwirkliche' or nonreal, whereas **würde** brings that which exists in thought into the real world for others to visualize.[78] Here are a few more examples of unreal conditions employing the replacement forms in the resulting clause:

9. Wenn es sonnig wäre, **würde** er draußen ***spielen***.

10. Wenn ich einen Garten hätte, **würde** ich Erbsen ***pflanzen***.

11. Ich **würde** mir die Sache ***überlegen***, wenn ich das Geld dafür hätte.

12. Ich **würde** ihn ***anstellen***, wenn ich etwas mehr über ihn wüßte.

---

[78] Schade 210.

In the following example, **würde** is used in the resulting clause to suggest what would happen in the future if the 'wenn-clause' turns out to be true.

13. Wenn es zu einer Krise käme, **würde** mancher seinen Arbeitsplatz ***verlieren***.[79]

The present subjunctive II modal verb forms **könnten**, **wollten**, **dürften**, **müßten**, and **sollten** + ***infinitive*** may also be used in main clauses of unreal conditions. They do not, however, serve as replacement forms to the **werden** + ***infinitive*** construction. Consider the examples below:

14. Wenn sie gute Noten hätte, **könnten** ihre Eltern nicht ***klagen***.
15. Ich **wollte** auch ***mitgehen***, wenn ich nicht schon etwas vorhätte.
16. Wenn meine Eltern nicht böse mit mir wären, **dürfte** ich ***ausgehen***.
17. Wenn ich im Lotto gewinnen würde, **müßte** ich das Geld ***teilen***.
18. Er **sollte** schneller ***arbeiten***, wenn er eine Pause machen wollte.

4.2.1.9. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English, the present subjunctive II modal verb forms **could**, **might**, and **should** + ***infinitive*** and similarly in German, **könnten**, **wollten**, **dürften**, **müßten**, and **sollten** + ***infinitive*** are used in main clauses of unreal conditions. In either language, they do not serve as a replacement to the **would** + ***infinitive*** construction since the meaning conveyed in the main clause is altered through the modal verb. Compare the following:

E: If he got another job now, he **could** ***go*** away for Christmas.

G: Wenn sie gute Noten hätte, **könnten** ihre Eltern nicht ***klagen***.

(b) **Would / würde** + ***infinitive*** is the basic construction in main clauses of unreal conditions in both English and German respectively:

---

[79] Schade 209.

E: If he got another job now, he **would** ***go*** away for Christmas.

G: Wenn sie gute Noten hätte, **würden** ihre Eltern nicht ***klagen***.

This is especially the case with confusable forms in German.

Contrasts

(a) In English, when using any main verb in a main clause of unreal condition, the main verb must be in the infinitive and must be accompanied by **would**. In German, the **würde** + ***infinitive*** construction is often used, however, the main verb can also be in the present subjunctive II form.

E: If I were you, I **would** ***leave*** tomorrow. (not *If I were you, I left tomorrow.)

E: If she came now, she **would** ***ruin*** the surprise. (not *If she came now, she ruined the surprise.)

G: Wenn er in die Stadt ginge, **würde** er wahrscheinlich spät nach Hause ***kommen***.

G: Wenn er in die Stadt ginge, **käme** er wahrscheinlich spät nach Hause.

4.2.2. Subordinate Clauses

4.2.2.1. Adverb Clauses

4.2.2.1.1. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in English

Contrasting with the indicative employed in expressing real conditions in modern English, the present subjunctive II is used to convey unreal conditions.[80] The subjunctive is used here to show that "the supposition is contrary to known facts."[81]

---

[80] "In older English, the present tense of the potential subjunctive was common [...] in the [real] condition instead of the present indicative, with virtually the same force, only presented from a little different point of view." Curme, English Grammar 245.

[81] Thomson and Martinet 198.

Perhaps the most common unreal condition is that which consists of an 'if-clause' using the present subjunctive II usually followed by **would** + ***infinitive*** in the resulting clause. Although **was** (sing.) is accepted in colloquial speech, e.g., <If I **was** you> in addition to the older subjunctive, e.g., <If I **were** you>, it is the older present subjunctive II **were** that is required in formal writing.[82] Consider the following examples:

1. If it **weren**'t for his record, he would be trusted. / If it **was**n't for his record, he would be trusted. (colloquial)
2. If I **were** sick, I would see a doctor. / If I was sick, I would see a doctor. (colloquial)
3. If you **were** here, I would have no worries.

An alternative to using the present subjunctive II **were** alone is to use **were** + *to* + ***infinitive***. This construction can be found in spoken and written English language.[83] Consider the examples below:

4. If he **were** *to* ***accept*** the job offer, he would have to move already next week.
5. If I **were** *to* ***go***, I would have time to visit my friends.

The above examples all begin with the conditional clause followed by the main clause. The order of clauses can, however, be reversed without resulting in a change in meaning as the following examples show.[84]

6. I would have no worries if you **were** here.

(= If you were here, I would have no worries.)

7. He would simply ask if he **needed** the car.

---

[82] Alice Maclin, Reference Guide to English. A Handbook of English as a Second Language (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981) 122.

[83] Thomson and Martinet 199.

[84] William E. Rutherford, Modern English. A Textbook for Foreign Students (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968) 431.

(= If he needed the car, he would simply ask.)

8. She would go for lunch with me, **had** she the time.

(= Had she the time, she would go for lunch with me.)

On occasion, the present subjunctive II forms of ***to be*** and ***to have*** can be used to replace the conjunction 'if'. This is usually used only in formal writing and as a result, indicative *was* cannot be used to replace present subjunctive II **were**, as is common practice in other types of clauses employing the subjunctive in spoken English. Consider the following examples:

9. **Were** he sick, he would see a doctor.

10. **Were** he ***to accept*** the job offer, he would have to move already next week.

11. **Had** I a million dollars, I would buy you a house.

12. **Had** we a cottage, we would spend every weekend there.

Sometimes present subjunctive II **should** + ***infinitive*** is used in addition to or instead of the 'if-clause'. Since this is usually done when expressing an order, the main clause is often in the imperative. Consider the examples below:

13. If you **should** ***have*** difficulty, don't hesitate to ask for help.

14. **Should** he ***arrive*** in the next hour, please have him call me.

The following are examples of unreal conditions employing the present subjunctive II forms of various verbs:

15. If you **could** go, I would drive you there.

16. If he **needed** the car, he would simply ask.

17. If she **bought** the necklace, she would be broke.

18. If he **drank**, he wouldn't drive.

19. If I **came**, he would be happy.

Normally, in written English, **would** is absent from the conditional clause, but in colloquial style, **would** finds frequent use. In the conditional clause introduced by 'if', we often find **would** + ***infinitive*** "if the speaker intends to single out the action of the subordinate clause,

giving it a nuance of dependency on the will or desire of the subject [...]".[85] In such instances, **would** conveys the meaning <be willing to>.[86] The following serve as examples:

20. If he **would** ***go***, he would probably have a good time.

21. If only he **would** ***take*** more care, he would raise his average.

22. If you **wouldn't** ***watch*** so much TV, you would get more work done.

With **would** being used in the 'if-clause', there is an implied meaning that the subject is unwilling to go through with the action.

The conjunction 'unless' can be used as an alternative to a negative 'if-clause'. Although 'unless' usually employs the indicative, there are instances where the present subjunctive II is used.

23. Unless it **were** accepted, I would resign.

instead of

24. If it **weren**'t accepted, I would resign.

25. I'll work the late shift unless you **preferred** to work it.

instead of

26. I'll work the late shift, if you **preferred** not to work it.

4.2.2.1.2. Subjunctive II in Unreal Conditions in German

The main use of the present subjunctive II in spoken and written German is in the expression of unreal conditions. An unreal condition consists of a conditional clause introduced typically by the conjunction 'wenn' and a main clause stating the consequence. When such conditions are unfulfillable and refer to hypothetical possibilities, "relating to the present

---

[85] Khlebnikova 64.

[86] Maclin 97.

moment or the immediate future,"[87] the present subjunctive II forms of the verb are used in both clauses to make the unlikelihood of the condition and consequence known. We will be concentrating on the present subjunctive II verb form in the adverb clause. Consider the following examples:

1. Wenn sie größer **wäre**, könnte sie mitgehen.
2. Wenn er mehr Zeit für sich **nähme**, wäre er nicht so gestreßt.
3. Wenn ich nicht so viel **arbeitete**, hätte ich mehr Freizeit.

The conditional clause is usually followed by the main clause; the order can, however, be reversed without a change in meaning:

4. Meine Mutter wäre froh, wenn Julia keine Schmerzen mehr **hätte**.

(=Wenn Julia keine Schmerzen mehr **hätte**, wäre meine Mutter froh.)

5. Was täten Sie, wenn Sie einen Mietwagen **hätten**?

(=Wenn Sie einen Mietwagen **hätten**, was täten Sie?

6. Was könntest du kaufen, wenn ich dir fünfzig Mark **gäbe**?

(=Wenn ich dir fünfzig Mark **gäbe**, was könntest du kaufen?)

The present subjunctive II forms of modal verbs + ***infinitive*** are also used:

7. Wir bräuchten mehr Eier, wenn wir einen Kuchen ***backen*** **wollten**.
8. Ich sollte jetzt eigentlich gehen, wenn ich noch rechtzeitig da ***sein*** **möchte**.
9. Wir müßten eigentlich helfen, wenn wir Erfolg ***haben*** **wollten**.

The present subjunctive II form of the main verb may be used to replace 'wenn' without changing the meaning of the clause:[88]

10. **Hätten** wir ein Kind, dann würden wir es sehr lieben.
11. **Regnete** es, so müßten wir zu Hause bleiben.

---

[87] Durrell 317.

[88] The adverbs 'dann' or 'so' is then normally found, however, linking the conditional clause to the main clause.

12. **Könnte** Richard kochen, so würde er nicht so oft ausgehen.

The present subjunctive II **sollte** + ***infinitive*** may be used in German in unreal conditions, in addition to or instead of the if-clause. The main clause is often in the imperative. Consider the examples below:

13. Wenn du Hilfe ***brauchen*** **solltest**, ruf mich an!

14. **Solltest** du vorbei ***gehen***, dann bring mir das Buch zurück.

Particularly when the present subjunctive II and past indicative forms are alike, it is common practice in spoken as well as written German to use either the present subjunctive II form of **werden** or a modal verb + ***infinitive*** in either clause.[89] Whether the speaker or writer chooses to use the subjunctive form of the main verb or the werden/modal + ***infinitive*** "depends on register and on the individual verb used [...]. Stylists have long recommended that sentences with the compound form in both clauses (i.e. with **würde** used twice) should be avoided."[90] In the following examples **würde** is used in both clauses:

15. Wenn ich 20 000 Mark im Lotto ***gewinnen*** **würde**, so würde ich sofort nach Teneriffa fliegen.[91]

16. Wenn sie ***mitkommen*** **würden**, würde ich das größere Auto ***nehmen***.

17. Wenn er seine Brille ***tragen*** **würde**, könnte er die Tafel gut ***lesen***.

The present subjunctive II of modal verbs is often used in the 'wenn-clauses' of spoken and written German. This is often done in scientific German to express possibilities that may exist or to describe what could go wrong if certain actions were carried out.[92]

18. Wenn wir daraus den Schluß ***ziehen*** **würden**, kämen wir zu einer eigenartigen Konstruktion.[93]

---

[89] Durrell 317.

[90] Durrell 317.

[91] Durrell 317.

[92] Schade 210.

4.2.2.1.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In both English and German, the present subjunctive II is used in the adverb clause of unreal conditions:

E: If I **had** a million dollars, I would buy you a house.

E: If he **drank**, he wouldn't drive.

G: Wenn sie größer **wäre**, könnte sie mitgehen.

G: Wenn er nicht so viel **arbeitete**, hätte er mehr Freizeit.

(b) In English and German, the present subjunctive II form of the verbs ***to be*** / ***sein*** and ***to have*** / ***haben*** may be used in place of 'if' / 'wenn' in the conditional clause:

E: **Were** he sick, he would see a doctor.

E: **Had** I a million dollars, I would buy a house.

G: **Wäre** ich ängstlich, so würde ich schweigen.

G: **Hätten** wir ein Kind, dann würden wir es sehr lieben.

(c) In English and German, the verb **should** / **sollten** + ***infinitive*** may also be used in addition to or instead of the 'if-clause' and the main verb is frequently an imperative:

E: If you **should** ***have*** difficulty, don't hesitate to ask for help.

E: **Should** he ***arrive*** in the next hour, please have him call me.

G: Wenn du Hilfe ***brauchen*** **solltest**, ruf mich an!

G: **Solltest** du ***vorbeigehen***, dann bring mir das Buch zurück!

(d) Although the conditional clause is usually followed by the main clause, the order can be reversed in both languages without a change in meaning:

E: If you **were** here, I would have no worries.

E: I would have no worries, if you **were** here.

G: Was täten Sie, wenn Sie einen Mietwagen **hätten**?

---

[93] Schade 210.

G: Wenn Sie einen Mietwagen **hätten**, was täten Sie?

(e) In English and German, the present subjunctive II of modals + ***infinitive*** is used in the conditional clause and **would / würde** + ***infinitive*** is avoided:

E: If I **could** ***do*** it, I would be very proud.

(rather than)

*E: If I **would** ***be able to*** do it, I would be very proud.

G: Wenn ich es ***machen*** **könnte**, wäre ich sehr stolz.

(rather than)

*G: Wenn ich es **würde** ***machen können***, wäre ich sehr stolz.

(f) In both English and German, there exists for regular verbs a stylistic preference for present subjunctive II in the conditional clause over the conditional verb phrase **would / würde** + ***infinitive***. Particularly in conversational style, this preference is disregarded:

E: If it **cost** less, I would go.

G: Wenn es weniger **kostete**, würde ich hingehen.

preferred over

E: If it **would** ***cost*** less, I would go.

G: Wenn es weniger ***kosten*** **würde**, würde ich hingehen.

Contrasts

(a) German may use the verb-first order in the conditional clause for all verbs. In English, it is restricted to ***to be*** and ***to have***:

E: **Were** he ***to accept*** the job offer, he would have to move already next week.

E: **Had** I a million dollars, I would buy you a house.

G: **Regnete** es, so müßten wir zu Hause bleiben.

G: **Könnte** Richard kochen, so würde er nicht so oft ausgehen.

(b) English unreal conditions introduced with **were** + ***to*** + ***infinitive*** do not have a formal equivalent in German.

4.2.2.1.4. Subjunctive II in Concessives in English

Concessive clauses in English which employ present subjunctive II, as opposed to present subjunctive I, have in the speaker's estimation very little chance of becoming true. They express situations which are antagonistic to the fulfillment of the main clause, but which would still not prevent it from becoming true. This differs from a conditional clause, which is the actual trigger or cause for the realization of the main clause. With present subjunctive II forms the examples are limited, as preference is often given to the indicative.[94]

Concessive clauses in English generally require the adverb 'even', which in most instances is in first position. ('Even' is not used, however, when the concessive begins with 'although'.) The present subjunctive II of the verb ***to be*** may also introduce the clause. Consider the following examples:

1. **Were** the danger even greater, I would feel compelled to go.[95]
2. Even if I **had** little time, I would still try to help him.
3. Even if I **were** poor, I would still have money for bingo.
4. Even if she **sent** the letter today, it wouldn't get here in time.
5. Even if he **came** now, it would be too late.

A present subjunctive II is not used after 'even though' or 'although' because it would be interpreted as past indicative:

6. Although I slept for two hours, I was still tired.

---

[94] This category is still, however, very much alive when used with pluperfect subjunctive II forms.

[95] This example of a concessive clause using present subjunctive II forms, being that it employs 'even', is said to differentiate itself from a conditional clause. Curme, English Grammar 196. Just as is the case with a conditional clause, **was** cannot be a substitute for **were** when beginning a concessive clause.

7. Even though I slept for two hours, I was still tired.

The two examples above would have to refer to a past occasion. If a hypothetical concession is intended, the conditional **would** + ***infinitive*** must be used:

8. Although I **would** ***sleep*** for two hours, I would still be tired.

9. Even though I **would** ***sleep*** for two hours, I would still be tired.

4.2.2.1.5. Subjunctive II in Concessives in German

Concessives stating unreal circumstances are expressed by means of the present subjunctive II. In German, there are several ways in which concessives can be expressed, some being more common than others. Despite the many possibilities, there is less tendency in spoken German to make use of such clauses, and alternatives usually using the indicative are preferred.[96] For our purposes, we will look at so-called 'typical' concessives, which although used more frequently in written German, can also be heard in the spoken language.

Let us first look at concessives introduced by 'wenn' followed by the present subjunctive II. Typically, the dependent clause in such a concessive has in the speaker's estimation little or no chance of coming true. True or false, it would not affect the chances of the resulting clause coming true but it represents a hypothetical situation and, as a result, the present subjunctive II form of the verb is used. Concessives "in which this subjunctive thus stands in the subordinate clause are in respect to mood and tense in both principal and subordinate clause exactly like unreal conditional sentences[.]"[97] There is a marker, normally 'auch', that is used in conjunction with 'wenn' that distinguishes an unreal concessive from an unreal condition, and such a

---

[96] Through examples, Kaufmann demonstrates the German speaker's tendency to refrain from using concessives in spoken German, and thereby limiting its use to the written language. Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 2.

[97] Curme, German Language 229.

concessive marker can be found either before or after 'wenn'.[98] The following serve as examples of the elements 'auch', 'sogar' and 'selbst' taking their place before 'wenn':,

1. Auch wenn sie wieder hier **wäre**, verziehe[99] ich ihr nicht.
2. Sogar wenn er mir das Buch umsonst **gäbe**, läse ich es nicht.
3. Selbst wenn wir ihm helfen **würden**, käme er nicht zurecht.[100]

The concessive clause may also begin with 'wenn' followed by the subject and the concessive marker. The following serve as examples:

4. Wenn sie auch wieder hier **wäre**, verziehe ich ihr nicht.
5. Wenn er mir das Buch sogar umsonst **gäbe**, läse ich es nicht.
6. Wenn wir selbst alles **täten**, wäre es nicht genug.

The adverb 'dann' can be placed after the above mentioned elements to produce an introductory clause to the 'wenn-clause'[101]:

7. Auch dann, wenn sie wieder hier **wäre**, verziehe ich ihr nicht.
8. Sogar dann, wenn er mir das Buch umsonst **gäbe**, läse ich es nicht.
9. Selbst dann, wenn wir ihm helfen **würden**, käme er nicht zurecht.

The conjunction 'und' can also be placed in front of 'wenn' or the element and 'wenn'[102], thus producing the following:

10. Und wenn Sie mir goldene Berge **gäben**, das würde ich nicht tun.[103]
11. Und auch wenn sie wieder hier **wäre**, verziehe ich ihr nicht.

---

[98] Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 5-6.

[99] The verb in the dependent clause is also in its present subjunctive II form. This clause is not a concessive clause however, but rather a hypothetical situation.

[100] Götze and Hess-Lüttich 110.

[101] Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 6.

[102] Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 6.

[103] Curme, German Language 229.

12. Und sogar wenn er mir das Buch umsonst **gäbe**, läse ich es nicht.

13. Und selbst wenn wir ihm helfen **würden**, käme er nicht zurecht.

14. Und auch dann, wenn sie wieder hier **wäre**, verziehe ich ihr nicht.

15. Und sogar dann, wenn er mir das Buch umsonst **gäbe**, läse ich es nicht.

16. Und selbst dann, wenn wir ihm helfen **würden**, käme er nicht zurecht.

When the concessive clause is not in initial position, but rather follows the main clause, all 'und...' sequences except 'und wenn' are disallowed:[104]

17. Ich verziehe ihr nicht, auch wenn sie wieder hier **wäre**.

18. Ich läse es nicht, sogar wenn er mir das Buch umsonst **gäbe**.

19. Er käme nicht zurecht, selbst wenn wir ihm helfen **würden**.

20. Ich verziehe ihr nicht - auch dann, wenn sie wieder hier **wäre**.

21. Ich läse es nicht - sogar dann, wenn er mir das Buch umsonst **gäbe**.

22. Er käme nicht zurecht - selbst dann, wenn wir ihm helfen **würden**.

23. Das würde ich nicht tun, und wenn Sie mir goldene Berge **gäben**.

The adverb 'noch' is often used in the 'wenn-clause' which serves as an intensifier and stresses the certainty of the main clause. The adverbial phrase 'noch so' in a concessive such as <Wenn es auch noch so schwierig **wäre**...> can also be used in the 'wenn-clause' as long as its use is not restricted by the adjective or verb in the sentence.[105]

The conjunction 'obwohl' is used to introduce a concessive clause which describes circumstances that are not significant enough to influence the circumstances described in the main clause.[106] It is through the use of the present subjunctive II that the hypothetical aspect of the concessive is stressed. Alternatives to 'obwohl' such as 'obgleich', 'obschon', 'wenngleich' or

---

[104] Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 6.

[105] Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 8.

[106] Schulz and Griesbach, Grammatik 304.

'trotzdem'[107] as well as 'obzwar' or 'wiewohl' in elevated or archaic German[108] may also be used. When the 'obwohl-clause' is in initial position, the adverbs 'doch' or 'dann' may be added to the following clause for emphasis and the two may be linked with the adverb 'so'. Consider the examples below:

24. Obwohl das vielleicht nicht die beste Lösung **wäre**, (so) wären wir doch damit zufrieden.

25. Vielleicht kommt er noch einmal auf diesen Punkt zurück. Obwohl mir das sehr unangenehm **wäre**, müßte ich dann klar Stellung beziehen.[109]

Concessives can also be introduced by means of the relative pronouns 'wer auch' and 'was auch' followed by the optional adverb 'immer' and present subjunctive II form of the verb.[110] The use of this verb form is, however, considered rather elevated in style and the replacement form **würde** + ***infinitive*** is preferred in colloquial German. The following serve as examples:

26. Wer auch immer dir helfen **möchte**, du kannst es nicht zu Ende bringen.

27. Was auch passieren **könnte**, ich muß morgen wieder hingehen.

Yet another type of concessive clause can be introduced with question adverbs such as 'wo', 'wie', 'wann' and 'wer' followed by 'auch immer'. Here again, the present subjunctive II or the **würde** + ***infinitive*** is used as the examples below show:

28. Wo auch immer Sie ***hingehen*** **würden**, niemand würde Ihnen folgen.[111]

29. Wie auch immer du **entschiedest**, es ist nicht die Wahrheit.

---

[107] DUDEN claims that "[d]ie Verwendung von *trotzdem* als konzessive Konjunktion wird in der Standardsprache weitgehend vermieden." Drosdowski et al., eds., Grammatik 379.

[108] Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 5.

[109] Kaufmann, "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung" 4.

[110] Marina Licen, "Der Modus im Konzessivsatz," Deutsch als Fremdsprache 3 (1981) : 134.

[111] The main clause, although in second position, still has normal word order. It is grammatically independent but logically dependent.

30. Wann auch immer ihr **kämet**, ihr kommt schon zu spät.

31. Wer auch immer hier ***eingesetzt*** **würde**, das Problem bliebe ungelöst.

Finally, the present subjunctive II of the verb ***sein*** may also introduce concessives:

32. **Wäre** die Gefahr auch noch viel größer, würde ich immernoch fahren.

4.2.2.1.6. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In English and German, the present subjunctive II is used in concessives:

E: Even if **I had** no time, I would still try to help him.

G: Auch wenn sie wieder hier **wäre**, verziehe ich ihr nicht.

(b) In both languages, concessives may begin with the present subjunctive II form **were** / ***wäre***.

E: **Were** the danger even greater,....

G: **Wäre** die Gefahr auch noch viel größer,....

Contrasts

(a) In German, there are many possibilities as to how concessives can be introduced using means other than a verb:

G: Auch wenn...

G: Selbst wenn...

G: Und sogar wenn...

G: Wer auch...

Providing the verb **were** is not in initial position, English concessives are either introduced by 'even if', 'although' or 'even though'.

(b) In German, present subjunctive II can be used after 'obwohl' whereas after English 'although' or 'even though' the **would** + ***infinitive*** construction must be used in order to preserve the subjunctive meaning. If the present subjunctive II form of the main verb is used, the clause will be understood as being past indicative.

E: Although I *slept* for two hours, I was still tired.

E: Although I **would** ***sleep*** for two hours, I would still be tired.

G: Obwohl das vielleicht nicht die beste Lösung **wäre**, (so) wären wir doch damit zufrieden.

(c) The concessive clause in English need not be in initial position. This is true also of most German concessive clauses, but those beginning with 'und...' sequences, with the exception of 'und wenn', must be in initial position.

4.2.2.1.7. Subjunctive II in Clauses of False Comparison in English

The verbs used in adverb clauses stating a false comparison beginning with 'as if' or 'as though' can appear either in the indicative or subjunctive mood. When the subjunctive is used in the false comparison clause, the "unreality or improbability or doubt in the present"[112] is indicated, whereas when the indicative is employed, the reality of the situation is stressed. The indicative verb in the introductory phrase can be either in the present or past without changing the tense of the subjunctive.[113] Although subjunctive II forms are identical to those of the past indicative, it should be noted that these subjunctive forms refer to "time that is simultaneous with that of the main verb."[114] The following sentences exemplify clauses of false comparison:

1. He looks as (he would look) if he **were** sick.[115]
2. He behaves as if he **were** angry with me.
3. Her husband treated her as though she **were** a child.

---

[112] Thomson and Martinet 254.

[113] Thomson and Martinet 254.

[114] Marcella Frank, Modern English. Part II: Sentences and Complex Structures (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972) 42.

[115] Curme, English Grammar 180.

4. She talks as though she **were** a queen.

5. The little boy acts as if he **had** no way home.

6. The young girl acted as though she **had** no mother.

7. She looks as if she **needed** sleep.

8. The young man acts as if he **owned** the place.

Unlike the 'if clauses' in unreal conditions, clauses expressing false comparisons cannot be in initial position ahead of the main clause.

'Like' is often used as a conjunction in colloquial speech to introduce the clause of false comparison instead of 'as if' or 'as though'.[116] However in such instances, the indicative rather than the subjunctive is used. Consider the examples below:

9. He looked like he *was* ill.

10. She acts like she *owns* the place.

The well known phrase 'as it **were**' is also an example of the present subjunctive II being used in a false comparison, the 'if', however, has been lost over time. Consider the examples below:

11. He was so strong-willed that he always tried to drag, as (if) it **were** (so), everybody to his point of view.[117]

12. Straight from the horse's mouth, as it **were**.

(As if it were straight from the horse's mouth.)

4.2.2.1.8. Subjunctive II in Clauses of False Comparison in German

"Considerable differences of opinion are expressed in the discussions of the dependent clauses normally introduced by 'als ob', 'als wenn', or 'als' in various books and articles on

---

[116] Curme, English Grammar 180.

[117] Curme, English Grammar 180.

German syntax and grammar."[118] Ulvestad believes these differences to be the results of the different style levels and the failure of grammarians to provide us with rules based on "adequate analysis of the formal structure of the language."[119]

In grammars, it is generally stated "that 'als ob' or 'als wenn' clauses are always expressed as contrary-fact conditions in Form II of the subjunctive,"[120] but the subjunctive I is also found frequently in literature. Meinke states "In view of the treatment of the *als ob (als wenn)* clauses in almost all of the elementary and intermediate German texts, it seems appropriate to investigate to what extent the information given is misleading."[121] Jäger addresses the topic of mood in a false comparison by saying:

> Die meisten Überlegungen zum 'irrealen' Vergleichssatz kreisen um die Frage, ob die Modusauswahl in diesen Sätzen völlig frei ist oder durch Konjunktiv I und II Bedeutungsvarianten zum Ausdruck kommen. Die Opposition Possibilität - Irrealität, die von vielen gesehen wurde, wird heute sehr allgemein geleugnet. Auch ich bin der Ansicht, daß die Wahl des Modus in dieser Hinsicht keine Rolle spielt, daß Realität, Irrealität oder Potentialität des 'Verglichenen' vom Kontext bestimmt wird.[122]

In an attempt to support the theory of 'Possibilität' and 'Irrealität', Meinke examined various works by twelve modern authors, which prove the explanations in fourteen elementary and intermediate texts to be inaccurate. He found that "authors quite often express them, in both the present and the past, in Form I of the subjunctive."[123] Although 'als ob' may be followed by

---

[118] Bjarne Ulvestad, "The Structure of the German Quasi Clauses," The Germanic Review 3 (1956) : 200.

[119] Ulvestad 200.

[120] W. G. Meinke, "The Use of *als ob (als wenn)* Clauses," The German Quarterly 28 (1955) : 47.

[121] Meinke 47.

[122] Siegfried Jäger, Der Konjunktiv in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. Untersuchungen an ausgewählten Texten. Vol. 1. Heutiges Deutsch. (München: Max Hueber; Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1971) 229.

[123] Meinke 47.

either subjunctive I or II, many grammars state that there is no difference in meaning between the two. DUDEN states that although subjunctive II is often used in order to stress the unreality of the comparison, there is no determinable difference between those sentences employing subjunctive I[124] and those employing subjunctive II.[125] According to Meinke, however, there is a different degree of possibility in a sentence with subjunctive I as opposed to subjunctive II. False comparisons which have "a strong element of possibility" use subjunctive I, whereas false comparisons that have virtually no chance of being true usually employ subjunctive II.[126]

Meinke's findings are most interesting in that they reveal the "discrepancy between theory and practice" but even Meinke questions "whether or not the evidence produced is sufficient to justify a reconsideration of the treatment of these clauses in the elementary texts."[127] Perhaps only the false comparisons using subjunctive II should be considered 'false comparisons' since they are truly false.

Now that we have taken into consideration the controversy surrounding the use of the subjunctive in clauses of false comparison, let us look at false comparisons concentrating on the more frequently employed subjunctive II.

In German, clauses of false comparison are introduced by the conjunctions 'als', 'als ob', 'wie wenn', or 'als wenn' and can be followed by subjunctive II, subjunctive I or the indicative.[128] The indicative is, however, only common in the colloquial language of northern Germany[129] and the present subjunctive II is used more frequently than the present subjunctive I.

---

[124] "When they are expressed in Form I they are generally used in the present and with the ommision of the *ob* or *wenn*." Meinke 47.

[125] Günther Drosdowski, et al., eds., Richtiges und gutes Deutsch 3rd ed., vol. 9, Duden (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut, 1985) 43.

[126] Meinke 48.

[127] Meinke 49.

[128] Jäger, Der Konjunktiv 221.

[129] Jäger, Der Konjunktiv 309.

The most frequently used conjunctions in false comparisons are 'als' and 'als ob' with 'als' occurring three to four times more frequently than 'als ob'.[130] Consider the following clauses of false comparisons introduced by 'als' and 'als ob' below followed by the present subjunctive II:

1. Sie sieht (so) aus, als **wäre** sie krank.
2. Er hat mich derart beschimpft, als **wäre** ich der schlimmste Verbrecher.[131]
3. Sie tut, als **kennte** sie uns nicht.
4. Er handelt, als ob er von Sinnen **wäre**.[132]

The conjunctions 'wie wenn' and 'als wenn' are used very infrequently[133]:

5. Sie schreit, wie wenn sie Schmerzen **hätte**.
6. Er tat, wie wenn er der Besitzer **wäre**.
7. Er fühlte sich, als wenn er eine Erkältung **hätte**.
8. Sie sprach auf eine Weise, als wenn sie betrunken **wäre**.

Sometimes the conjunction 'daß' can be used to introduce a clause of false comparison as seen in the example below:

9. Jetzt stellt er es so hin, daß ich allein an allem schuld **wäre**.[134]

---

[130] According to Jäger's findings in chosen texts from the Mannheimer Corpus. Jäger, Der Konjunktiv, 226, table.

[131] Gerhard Kaufmann, "Zu den durch 'als', 'als ob', 'wie wenn', 'als wenn' eingegleiteten 'Komparativsätzen'," Zielsprache Deutsch 3 (1973) : 98.

[132] Adolf Lamprecht, Grammatik der Englischen Sprache. 6th ed. (Cornelson: Velhagen & Klasing, 1980) 333.

[133] Jäger, Der Konjunktiv 309, table.

[134] Kaufmann, "'Komparativsätzen'" 105.

4.2.2.1.9. Comparison

Parallels

(a) False comparisons in English and German employ the present subjunctive II:

E: The young girl acts as though she **had** no mother.

E: She looks as if she **needed** sleep.

G: Er tut, wie wenn er der Besitzer **wäre**.

G: Sie sieht (so) aus, als **wäre** sie krank.

(b) In both languages, the indicative verb in the introductory phrase can be based either on the present or past stem without changing the tense of the subjunctive verb.

E: Her husband treated her as though she **were** a child.

E: She talks as though she **were** a queen.

G: Sie schreit, wie wenn sie Schmerzen **hätte**.

G: Sie sprach auf eine Weise, als wenn sie betrunken **wäre**.

(c) Unlike the 'if clauses' in unreal conditions, English and German clauses of false comparisons cannot be in initial position ahead of the main clause.

(d) In colloquial English, 'like' often introduces a clause of false comparison instead of 'as if' or 'as though' and the indicative form of the verb is used. In colloquial German, the indicative is also used in false comparisons, more so in northern Germany.

4.2.2.2. Noun Clauses

4.2.2.2.1. Subjunctive II in Hypothetical Situations in English

Sometimes the speaker or writer wants to create a hypothetical situation that would then reveal what would happen if the circumstances were true. Such clauses are introduced by words that propose the hypothetical situation such as 'imagine', 'suppose', 'say', and 'what if' and are followed by the present subjunctive II, as the following examples show:

1. Imagine she **were** here: I could help her with her problems.

2. Suppose he **came** an hour earlier: would that give you two enough time to set up?

3. Say **I built** the harrow-packer myself: would you give me 500 dollars off?

The modals **should** and **could** + ***infinitive*** or **would** + ***infinitive*** are also frequently employed in hypothetical situations:

4. What if he **should** ***leave*** early: would you have everything ready?

5. Imagine they **could**n't ***afford*** it: what would they do to raise money?

6. Suppose she **would**n't ***accept***: whom else could you ask to go along?

4.2.2.2.2. Subjunctive II in Hypothetical Situations in German

In German, hypothetical situations are often expressed in the present subjunctive II, although there is a tendency to use the indicative:

1. Stell dir vor, ich **hätte** Geld: Ich würde um die Welt reisen.

2. Nehmen wir mal an, ich **käme** mit: Wäre Platz im Auto für mich?

3. Angenommen, ich **ginge** jeden Montag tanzen: Würdest du mitkommen?

Hypothetical situations are also expressed using the present subjunctive II of the modals **können**, **wollen**, **müssen**, and **dürfen** and the **würde** + ***infinitive*** construction:

4. Stell dir vor, du **könntest** fliegen: Welches Land würdest du besuchen?

5. Angenommen, sie **wollte** nicht mit: Könnte sie bei dir übernachten?

6. Nehmen wir mal an, ich **müßte** schon am Mittwoch gehen: Wäre das problematisch?

7. Stell dir vor, er **dürfte** mit ins Konzert: Wäre das nicht toll?

8. Angenommen, sie **würde** noch eine Karte ***kaufen***: Hättest du Lust mitzukommen?

4.2.2.2.3. Comparison

Parallels

(a) In both English and German, hypothetical situations are expressed using the present subjunctive II of main verbs, modal verbs and **would / würde** + ***infinitive***:

E: Suppose he **came** an hour earlier: would that give you two enough time to set up?

E: Suppose they **couldn't** ***afford*** it: what could they do to raise money?

E: Suppose she **wouldn't** ***accept***: whom else could you take along?

G: Nehmen wir mal an, ich **käme** mit: Wäre Platz im Auto für mich?

G: Stell dir vor, du **könntest** fliegen: Welches Land würdest du besuchen?

G: Angenommen, sie **würde** noch eine Karte ***kaufen***: Hättest du Lust mitzukommen?

4.2.2.2.4. Subjunctive II of Exception and Unfulfilled Expectation in German

In German, the optative present subjunctive II is used in clauses of exception introduced by 'als daß'. Statements expressing exceptions begin with a clause stating what would exist in reality, if it were not for the circumstance in the second clause. If the circumstance in the clause of exception is fact and there is little hope of the opposite being true, the present subjunctive II form of the verb is used. The following serve as examples:

1. Es fehlt uns nichts, als daß du da **wärst**.[135]
2. Dem Weine fehlt nichts, als daß er völlig geklärt **wäre**.[136]

Another type of exception clause employing the present subjunctive II and 'denn', describes a state of affairs which, if realized, would prevent the initial clause from becoming

---

[135] Curme, German Language 228.

[136] Curme, German Language 228.

true. The doubt that the second clause will become true is expressed with the use of the present subjunctive II and the following 'denn' introduces the opposing factor. Consider the examples below:

3. Er ist verloren, es **geschähe** denn ein Wunder.[137]

4. Das Baby wird sterben, es **käme** denn die Ärztin.

The conjunction 'außer' can also be used in clauses of exception. In such instances, 'denn' is omitted and the verb is in either second or final position.

5. Er ist verloren, außer es **geschähe** ein Wunder.

6. Das Baby wird sterben, außer die Ärztin augenblicklich **käme**.

The conjunction 'als daß' can also be used to introduce adverb clauses expressing an expectation that cannot be fulfilled. These clauses of exception require the present subjunctive II. The preceding clause must contain some form of a negative which is usually expressed through 'zu', a negated 'genug'[138] or 'nicht so' found before an adjective or adverb. Consider the following examples employing present subjunctive II forms of ***sein*** and ***haben***:

7. Es ist schon zu spät, als daß mein Vater noch im Büro **wäre**.[139]

8. Er ist zu friedlich, als daß er noch Schmerzen **hätte**.

The present subjunctive II of modal verbs as well as the **würde** + ***infinitive*** is frequently used in adverb clauses of unfulfilled expectations:

9. Er hat zu geringe Kenntnisse, als daß er Erfolg haben **könnte**.[140]

10. Das Wasser ist zu kalt, als daß man baden **könnte**.[141]

---

[137] Drosdowski et al., eds., Grammatik 163.

[138] Durrell 256.

[139] Schulz and Griesbach, Grammatik 54.

[140] Schade 183.

[141] Gerhard Helbig and Joachim Buscha, Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht (Leipzig: Enzyklopädie, 1981) 594.

11. Sie ist zu krank, als daß sie noch leben **wollte**.
12. Ich bin zu müde, als daß ich jetzt fahren **dürfte**.
13. Es ist nicht spät genug, als daß wir jetzt gehen **müßten**.
14. Sie ist nicht albern genug, als daß sie mogeln **würde**.

Clauses of unfulfilled expectation can also be introduced by 'ohne daß' and 'nicht daß'. Here again the present subjunctive II is required. The following serve as examples:

15. Er hat bloß keine Zeit, nicht daß er zu faul **wäre**.
16. Sie fängt an zu fotografieren, ohne daß sie Erlaubnis **hätte**.
17. Er geht fort, ohne daß er zuerst zur Arbeit **käme**.
18. Er ist gut vorbereitet, nicht daß man das merken **könnte**.
19. Man sollte die Kunst fördern, nicht daß ich das Bild kaufen **würde**.

Unlike in German, clauses of exception and unfulfilled expectation in English employ indicative verb forms, even though the chance of the clause coming true is remote.

4.2.2.2.5. Subjunctive II of Indirect Speech in German

Sometimes the speaker may choose to relay the words of another, even though the credibility of the report is questionable. Through the use of the present subjunctive II, the speaker's doubt is not stated directly but rather implied. "In modern German, such use is almost completely reserved for cases where the speaker has strong mental reservations about the truth of what he is saying."[142] Consider the examples below:

1. Matthias sagte, daß er heute nicht ins Kino geht, weil er Kopfschmerzen **hätte**.
2. Agatha erzählte mir, daß die Inflationsrate Frankreichs 12 % **wäre**.
3. Ich habe gehört, daß die Studiengebühren nächstes Jahr steigen **würden**.
4. Paul sagte, daß er jeden Sonntag in die Kirche **ginge**.

---

[142] Kufner 86.

In English, the indicative is used in indirect speech, whether the report is believeable or not. The speaker can express feelings of doubt simply by changing the verb of saying or the intonation of the utterance:

5. She said that she liked her present.

6. He claimed that the money was there when he closed the store.

7. They insist that they didn't see the approaching car.

5. USES OF THE PAST SUBJUNCTIVE I AND II

In the previous chapter, the uses of the present subjunctive were examined in great detail. Since the uses of the past subjunctive are semantically parallel to those of the present subjunctive, special attention will not be drawn to the uses of the past subjunctive. Mention will be made, however, of five special cases:

a) The absence of the past subjunctive I in real wishes for reasons of logic:

E: *Long have liberty lived! (cf. Long live liberty!)

G: *Er habe sanft geruht! (cf. Er ruhe sanft!)

b) The absence of the past subjunctive II in polite requests and statements, again for reasons of logic:

E: *Would you have please been able to shut the door? (cf. Could you please shut the door?)

G: *Hätten wir schon losfahren wollen? (cf. Wollten wir schon losfahren?)

c) The absence of the past subjunctive II in implied conditions and select unreal conditions in German because of idiomatic restrictions:

G: *Das hätte richtig sein dürfen. (cf. Das dürfte richtig sein.)

G: *Wenn du Hilfe hättest brauchen sollen.... (cf. Wenn du Hilfe brauchen solltest....)

d) The use of the past subjunctive II in clauses expressing unfulfilled expectations, which only occur in German (see next section).

5.1. Potential Subjunctive

5.1.1. Independent Clauses

5.1.1.1. Subjunctive II of Unfulfilled Expectations in German

In expressing unfulfilled expectations in German, the present subjunctive II is used often in conjunction with an adverb such as 'beinahe', or 'fast'. Together the subjunctive verb and

adverb act in stressing the fact that the occurrence could have happened, although in reality it did not.

1. Sie **wäre** fast vom Pferd *gefallen*.[143]
2. Mein Freund **hätte** fast einen Unfall *gehabt*.

In English, an unfulfilled expectation is conveyed through means of an adverb and the past indicative of the main verb.

3. She almost *tripped* over the books.

---

[143] Schulz and Griesbach, Grammatik 55.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1. Form

Our examination of present-day English and German subjunctive forms shows that there are considerable morphological differences. Syncretism has taken place in the inflectional morphology of English, whereas the German inflectional system has experienced only a minimal degree of change from that of Middle High German. The subjunctive in German, therefore, with a variety of 'actual' endings has many more grammatical distinctions than the subjunctive in English, which has only zero-endings. In English, the indicative / subjunctive I distinction can only be made for verbs in the third person singular, where the *-s* inflection is absent in the subjunctive and present in the indicative (e.g., in 3rd pers. sing. E: pres. ind. *speaks* - pres. subj. I **speak**). The verb ***to be*** is the single exception to this statement with the subjunctive I form for all persons being **be**. In German, the subjunctive I is usually different from the indicative in the second and third person singular and the second person plural (e.g., in 3rd pers. sing. G: pres. ind. *spricht* - pres. subj. I **spreche**). All English subjunctive II verbs forms are identical in form to the past indicative, the only existing morphological distinction being again the verb ***to be***, which is unlike the indicative in the singular form (e.g., in 1st and 3rd pers. sing. E: past. ind. *was* - pres. subj. II **were**). German subjunctive II of strong verbs, unlike the English subjunctive II, has a morphology in which most forms are distinct from those of the indicative (e.g., in 3rd pers. sing. G: past ind. *sprach* - pres. II **spräche**). The first and third person plural of the non-umlautable strong verbs and all forms of regular weak verbs are, however, identical with indicative forms (e.g., G: **gingen**, **sagten**).

In the morpheme analysis, the English and German indicative forms are analyzed as root / stem + tense / personal ending. The absence of a mood marker indicates the indicative. (The absence of a subject would indicate the imperative.) For the subjunctive, mood markers are apparent in German; thus we analyze for both languages: root / stem + subjunctive / personal ending, but English has a zero morph ending.

6.2. Validity of Subjunctive Category

A modern view in English grammar is that the subjunctive does not exist and instead the subjunctive II verb forms are referred to as 'remote tense'.[144] The subjunctive verb forms are considered to be 'back-shifted'[145] (e.g., *take*; *is* → (back-shifted) **took**; **was**), which is the same principle as that involved in a 'deictic shift'.[146] The basis of this principle is as follows: when speaking about the past, the speaker distances himself from what is being said by using the remote tense, commonly known as the past tense. Since subjunctive II verbs are identical in form to the past tense (with the exception of the verb ***to be***), they too must be in the remote tense. These back-shifted verb forms may be also employed to express unreality, because the speaker may choose to indicate distance or remoteness from an unreal event. The following sentences can be used to demonstrate the illogicality of the remote tense in English:

1. He *wrote* this a moment ago.
2. He *wrote* this a thousand years ago.
3. *In a thousand years they still *wrote* books.

Sentence 1 is in no way remote and sentence 2 is very remote; therefore remoteness contrasting with immediacy does not incur a change in verb form. Sentence 3, because semantically impossible, demonstrates that remote does not apply to the 'remote future'. Since *wrote* can apply to the past but not the future, it is a temporal tense form and is not in an aspectual category of remoteness. The essential feature of the verb *wrote* is a reference to past time. Another argument against remoteness is that if remoteness existed in the past, one should expect remoteness in the present and future tense, just as the continuous aspect is a part of all tenses.

---

[144] See: Robert Livingston Allen, The Verb System of Present-Day American English (The Hague: Mouton, 1966) 173-176. Martin Joos, The English Verb. Forms and Meanings (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1964.) 121-125. F. R. Palmer, The English Verb. 2nd ed. (London: Longman Group, 1987) 44-46.

[145] Allen 173.

[146] Palmer, The English Verb 46.

Palmer and Joos must regard 'took' as a single morph with a [remote] component of meaning. A good argument can be made against this. Consider the following sentences:

4. If he *was* early, he always got a good seat.
5. If he *took* the bus, he always arrived early.
6. If he **were / was** early, he would get a better seat.
7. If he **took** the bus, he would arrive earlier.

The verbs *was* and *took* in sentences 4 and 5 are in the remote tense, expressing events that happened in the past. The verbs **were / was** and **took** in sentences 6 and 7 employ the [remote] component again but the context brings with it the change of a [past] to a [non-past] subcomponent. The fact that the same phonemic sequence contains a [past] and a [non-past] subcomponent makes it a virtual necessity for there to be two morphs, because the past / non-past tense contrast in the English verb system is too fundamental to be systematically ignored by inclusion within the same class of morphs.

Since the idea of remoteness is difficult to work into the verb system as a whole, it is preferable to consider the past indicative forms and the present subjunctive II forms to be homophones, each with its own distinct grammatical meaning. The indicative form *took* (5) has the grammatical components [past] and [real], and **took** (7) has the components [non-past] and [unreal]. The desirable result is that we put into a grammar two separate though homophonous morphs in each lexical verb with non-overlapping meanings, which respect the past / non-past tense division. Consider Table 1:

Table 1

	[Past]	[Non-past]
(Indicative) [Real]	a. *took*	b. *takes*
(Subj. II) [Unreal]	c. **had** taken	d. **took**

a. The thief *took* the dress.

b. It *takes* a long time to learn.

c. If he **had** taken more time, he would have gotten better results.

d. If he **took** more time, he would get better results.

This analysis requires the use of four semantic components [real], [unreal], [past], and [non-past] as used in Table 1. This shows that /tuk/ is two morphs, each with different semantic content. In sentence (a) /tuk/ refers to a real past event and hence has the components [real] and [past], whereas /tuk/ in sentence (d) refers to a hypothetical state of affairs in non-past time and therefore has the components [unreal] and [non-past]. The remaining combinations of the paired components dovetail with the analysis of sentences (a) and (d). In sentence (b), /te:ks/ refers to an actual state of affairs in the non-past and hence is characterized by the semantic components [real] and [non-past]. In sentence (c) /hæd te:kən/ refers to a hypothetical event in past time and therefore has the components [unreal] and [past].

Additionally, the Palmer / Joos / Allen analysis makes no provision for the present subjunctive I, although logically it could also be considered remote, since it is used for what is merely possible and not factual, nor is it part of the speaker's experience. To include the present subjunctive I in the same category as the past indicative and present subjunctive II would create an unworkable verb system; whereas it is easy to include it in the emerging system proposed above, as Table 2 illustrates:

Table 2

	[Past]	[Non-past]
(Indicative) [Real]	a. *took*	b. *takes*
(Subj. II) [Unreal]	c. **had** taken	d. **took**
(Subj. I) [Possible]	e. **have** taken	f. **take**

e. It is necessary that every student **have** taken the placement exam before registering for courses.

f. It is necessary that each student **take** the placement exam before registering for courses.

The [unreal] can include the impossible. That is, in sentence (d), the use of the form /tuk/ does not imply that more time could have been taken. Thus the component [unreal] can be separated from a component [possible], which does imply that an event is both hypothetical and possible. In sentence (e), /hæv te:kən/ refers to a completed action which is not fact but is necessarily capable of coming true. Therefore, we assign the semantic component [possible] to the situation which has not yet taken place but must be completed before the point in time referred to by 'registering'. For this reason, we also assign it the component [past]. (This avoids the necessity of incorporating a perfect aspect into the presently proposed system.) In sentence (f), /te:k/ refers to an event in non-past time which is not fact but may become true. We therefore combine the components [possible] with [non-past]. Not only does this make logical sense in the English verb system but it also applies to the German verb system. Consider Table 3:

Table 3

	[Past]	[Non-past]
(Indicative) [Real]	a. *ging*	b. *geht*
(Subj. II) [Unreal]	c. **wäre** gegangen	d. **ginge**
(Subj. I) [Possible]	e. **sei** gegangen	f. **gehe**

a. Er *ging* gestern in die Stadt.

b. Er *geht* jeden Tag in die Stadt.

c. Wenn er gestern in die Stadt gegangen **wäre**,....

d. **Ginge** er jeden Tag in die Stadt,....

e. Peter sagte, er **sei** gestern in der Stadt gewesen.

f. Peter sagte, er **gehe** jeden Tag in die Stadt.

The system covers the German verb system as adequately as it covers the English verb system. There is no need to make a special case for sentence type (e). The indirect speech contains the past subjunctive which refers simply to past time, whereas in English, the combination of the components [possible] and [past] require that [past] be understood as relevant to a certain point in time made clear in the context of the sentence.

6.3. Use and Prospects

The ranges of use of the English and German subjunctive are to a large degree similar. These similarities are unfortunately rarely used in the teaching of the subjunctive and find no mention in grammars. Although it is true that the distinct subjunctive forms are found more frequently in German than in English, the same functions can be served in both languages. In our examination of the uses of the English and German subjunctive, it is apparent that the

subjunctive modality is still expressible, whether the subjunctive mood forms are distinct from the indicative or not. In English, the context and syntactical indicators (e.g., 'if' in conditions) usually play a key role in conveying the intended modality and meaning of an utterance.

The frequency of use of the English subjunctive has diminished greatly in comparison to the German subjunctive, however. Some utterances in English that once required the subjunctive are now expressed in the indicative (e.g., indirect speech), although through the context the subjunctive meaning of the utterance is not lost, which supplies an explanation for the decline in the use of the subjunctive. In today's English, the subjunctive is used primarily in elevated language in legal documents, parliamentary proceedings and bureaucratic communications.[147] Residues of the once prevailing subjunctive can still be found in idiomatic and set expressions, but as far as the spoken and written English of today is concerned, there is a growing tendency to substitute the indicative for the subjunctive I or to use the **would** + ***infinitive*** construction as a replacement for the subjunctive II. Hence, the subjunctive is considered by many to be old-fashioned or formal. However, this overlooks the firm hold of the subjunctive II in unreal conditional clauses after 'if' (e.g., If we **went** now,....) or in hypothetical situations (e.g., Imagine you **were** on a desert island.). Such forms are part of conversational English and hence not currently threatened in formal English. The long term trend is, however, clearly toward replacement.

The German subjunctive is facing a slightly different fate. The present subjunctive I tends to be replaced by the present subjunctive II especially in spoken German (e.g., Herr Gruber sagte, daß seine Frau im Krankenhaus **läge**. rather than: Herr Gruber sagte, daß seine Frau im Krankenhaus **liege**.[148]) or, just as in English, by the indicative (e.g., Herr Gruber sagte, daß seine Frau im Krankenhaus *liegt*.[149]) Although the spoken language tends to use the indicative in

---

[147] Maclin 324.

[148] Durrell 309.

[149] Durrell 309.

direct and indirect speech, the press still depends greatly on the subjunctive I for concise and neutral reporting. Since the most prominent use of the present subjunctive I is in indirect speech, it would appear that its existence is, for the time being at least, quite secure.

The use of the German present subjunctive II is also on the decline, just as in English. Many of the present subjunctive II forms are either identical with the past indicative (e.g., **gingen**; **machten**) or are considered to be old-fashioned (e.g., **hülfe**; **flösse**) and therefore are often replaced with **würde** + ***infinitive*** in both written and spoken German.[150] The parallel gradual loss of the simple past indicative, which is being replaced by the present perfect, also hastens the erosion of less common present subjunctive II forms because these are derived from the disappearing past indicative forms. It is the frequency of the present subjunctive II forms of the auxiliaries (e.g., **hätte**, **wäre**, **könnte**) and popular main verbs (e.g., **käme**, **ginge**) whose replacement would mean increased complexity (e.g., Das **würde** ich nicht gesagt ***haben***.), that will slow down the decline of the subjunctive II in German. It remains markedly more prominent in German than in English because of the greater frequency of uniquely subjunctive forms.

6.4. Application

This comparative grammar of the English and German subjunctive should prove helpful to anyone who has learned the subjunctive of either English or German and wishes to understand the forms and uses of the subjunctive in the other language. The parallels between the two languages will show the learner which rules can be applied to the other language without interference, and the contrasts will give warning of the differences that can lead to errors in the target language. The overviews of the English and German subjunctive found in grammars are for the most part unsystematic and incomplete, making the learning and later use of the subjunctive very difficult for the foreign language learner. This comparison of the English and

---

[150] Schade 209.

German subjunctive represents a store of unused potential for a better understanding of the English and German subjunctive for both the native speaker and the foreign language learner.

The primary objective of this comparative grammar is to create an overview of the forms and the uses of the subjunctive in English and German. During the course of this work, there emerges a clear demonstration that English does possess a subjunctive and some false notions concerning the subjunctive are corrected. An example of a misconception is the belief that the request <Everybody stand up!> is an imperative. The request <Nobody move!> serves as proof that the two request are indeed subjunctive, since <Nobody move!> cannot be addressed to an individual called 'nobody'. New insights can also be gained from this thesis; perhaps the most surprising being the closeness and frequency of parallels between the English and German subjunctive. A fuller understanding of the logico-semantic role of the subjunctive in English and German was achieved, as was also a comprehension of how over time the subjunctive has been or is being replaced by suitable lexical units. For example **stünde** is being replaced by the construction **würde** ***stehen*** or the no longer existent English sentence <*A be a point on XY.> now reads <Let A be a point on XY.>. These expansions through the introduction of semantically suitable morphs are events which reveal the general tendency towards a more analytical structure in both English and German.

The applications this thesis could have to teaching are numerous. For example, once the student is aware that both English and German have present subjunctive II forms based on the past tense form of the verb, the parallel could be exploited with an exercise like the following:

A. Wenn ich reich _____, dann würde ich um die Welt reisen. (sein)

B. If I _____ rich, I would travel around the world. (be)

With the context, the student would realize that these sentences are not in the past tense because they do not refer to past time. The sentences must therefore require a present subjunctive II form of the verb since they refer to an unreal event in present time. The terms 'present subjunctive' and 'past subjunctive' would become more meaningful.

In the standard language, the subjunctive in English and German does have its place and a thorough understanding of it is necessary for making recommendations concerning its use. The foregoing is not meant to be an exhaustive list of the many benefits and applications arising from the study. This would take us beyond the intended scope of the thesis. It is, however, an indication of opportunities for further investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Ernest W. "Subjunctive and Indicative Conditionals." Foundations of Language 6.1 (1970) : 89-94.

Admoni, Wladimir. Der deutsche Sprachbau. 3rd ed. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1970.

---. Die Entwicklung des Satzbaus der deutschen Literatursprache im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Ed. Günter Feudel and Joachim Schmidt. Bausteine zur Sprachgeschichte des Neuhochdeutschen. Vol. 62. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987.

Allen, Robert Livingston. The Verb System of Present-Day American English. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

Bausch, Karl-Heinz. Modalität und Konjunktivgebrauch in der gesprochenen deutschen Standardsprache. Heutiges Deutsch. Vol. 1.9. Part 1. München: Max Huber, 1979.

---. "Zur Darstellung des Konjunktivs in einer deutschen Grammatik für Ausländer (1. Teil)." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 1 (1980) : 31-37.

---. "Zur Darstellung des Konjunktivs in einer deutschen Grammatik für Ausländer (2. Teil)." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 2 (1980) : 65-70.

Bech, G. "Über den Gebrauch des Präsens Konjunktiv im Deutschen." Lingua 12 (1963) : 39-58.

Bergmann, Rolf and Peter Pauly. Neuhochdeutsch. Arbeitsbuch zur Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1983.

Boost, Karl. "Die mittelbare Feststellungsweise. Eine Studie über den Konjunktiv." Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde (1940) : 284-94.

Brinkmann, Hennig. Die deutsche Sprache. Gestalt und Leistung. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1962.

Buscha, Joachim. "Altes und Neues vom Konjunktiv." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 2 (1987) : 68-75.

Buscha, Joachim and Irene Zoch. Der Konjunktiv. 1st ed. Leipzig: VEB Enzyklopädie Leipzig, 1984.

Curme, George O. A Grammar of the German Language. 2nd ed. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1922.

---. English Grammar. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1953.

Czarnecki, Tomasz. "Unterschiedliches und Gemeinsames beim deutschen und polnischen Konjunktiv." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 4 (1972) : 244-48.

Davis, Wayne, A. "Indicative and Subjunctive Conditionals." The Philosophical Review 88.4 (1979) : 544-63.

Drosdowski, Günther, et al., eds. Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. 4th ed. Duden. Vol. 4. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut, 1984.

---. Richtiges und gutes Deutsch. 3rd ed. Duden. Vol. 9. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut, 1985.

Durrell, Martin. Hammer's German Grammar and Usage. 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold, 1991.

Erben, Johannes. Abriß der deutschen Grammatik. 6th ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.

---. Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Leitfaden. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei, 1968.

Ferreira, Linda A. Verbs in Action. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1978.

Flämig, Walter. "Sagen - Fragen - Heischen. Über die unterschiedliche Leistung sprachlicher Elemente im Satz." Der Deutschunterricht 5 (1961) : 62-87.

---. Zum Konjunktiv in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. Inhalte und Gebrauchsanweisen. 2nd ed. Berlin: Akademie, 1962.

Förster, Uwe. "Maskeraden im Gegenwartsdeutsch. Zur Stilfarbe im Sprachgebrauch." Muttersprache 5-6 (1982) : 320-23.

Fourquet, Jean. "Zum Gebrauch des deutschen Konjunktivs." Linguistische Studien 4. Teil 2. Festgabe für Paul Grebe zum 65. Geburtstag. Sprache der Gegenwart 24. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1973.

Frank, Marcella. Modern English. Part II: Sentences and Complex Structures. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Glinz, Hans. Deutsche Grammatik I. Studienbücher zur Linguistik und Literatur-wissenschaft. Vol. 2. Bad Homburg: Athenäum, 1970.

---. Die Innere Form des Deutschen. 2nd ed. Bern: A. Franke, 1952.

Götze, Lutz and Ernest W. B. Hess-Lüttich. Knaurs Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. Sprachsystem und Sprachgebrauch. München: Lexikographisches Institut, 1989.

Grepl, Miroslav and Zdeněk Masarik. "Zur Kategorie der Modalität im Deutschen und Tschechischen aus konfrontativer Sicht." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 6 (1974) : 370-378.

Griesbach, Heinz. Moderner deutscher Sprachgebrauch. Ein Lehrgang für Fortgeschrittene. München: Max Hueber, 1966.

Hammer, Arnold Edward. German Grammar and Usage. London: A. E. Hammer, 1983.

Hanks, Patrick, ed. Collins Dictionary of the English Language. 2nd ed. London: Collins, 1986.

Harsh, Wayne. The Subjunctive in English. Alabama Linguistic and Philological Series 15. Alabama: U of Alabama P, 1968.

Hawkins, John A. A Comparative Typology of English and German. Texas: U Texas P, 1986.

Heidolph, Karl Erich, et al. Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik. Berlin: Akademie, 1981.

Die Heilige Schrift. Zwingli-Bibel. Zürich: Zwingli, 1955.

Helbig, Gerhard. Deutsche Grammatik. Grundfragen und Abriß. München: Iudicium, 1991.

Helbig, Gerhard and Joachim Buscha. Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie, 1981.

Hellinger, Marlis. Kontrastive Grammatik. Deutsch/Englisch. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1977.

Herbst, Thomas, et al. Grimm's Grandchildren. Current Topics in German Linguistics. New York: Longman Group, 1979.

Jäger, Siegfried. Der Konjunktiv in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. Untersuchungen an ausgewählten Texten. Heutiges Deutsch. Vol. 1. München: Max Hueber; Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1971.

---. "Die Sprachnorm als Aufgabe von Sprachwissenschaft und Sprachpflege." Wirkendes Wort 6 (1968) : 361-74.

---. Empfehlungen zum Gebrauch des Konjunktivs. Sprache der Gegenwart 10. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1970.

---. "Gebrauch und Leistung des Konjunktivs in der deutschen geschriebenen Hochsprache der Gegenwart." Wirkendes Wort 21 (1971) : 238-54.

James, Francis. Semantics of the English Subjunctive. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 1986.

Jongeboer, H.A. Im Irrgarten der Modalität. Ein Kapitel aus der deutschen Grammatik. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1985.

Joos, Martin. The English Verb. Forms and Meanings. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1964.

Karttunen, Lauri. "Presuppositions of Compound Sentences." Linguistic Inquiry 4.2 (1973) : 169-93.

Kasper, Walter. Semantik des Konjunktivs II in Deklarativsätzen des Deutschen. Reihe Germanistische Linguistik. Vol. 71. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1987.

Kaufmann, Gerhard. Das konjunktivische Bedingungsgefüge im heutigen Deutsch. Institut für deutsche Sprache. Forschungsberichte. Vol. 12. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1972.

---. "Hat der deutsche Konjunktiv 'ein voll ausgebautes Tempussystem'?" Zielsprache Deutsch 2 (1971) : 51-62.

---. "Zu den durch 'als', 'als ob', 'wie wenn', 'als wenn' eingeleiteten 'Komparativsätzen'." Zielsprache Deutsch 3 (1973) : 91-111.

---. "Zum Bedingungsgefüge." Zielsprache Deutsch 4 (1973) : 141-54.

---. "Zur 'konzessiven' Beziehung." Zielsprache Deutsch 1 (1974) : 1-20.

Khlebnikova, Irina B. The Conjunctive Mood in English. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Kratzer, Angelika. Semantik der Rede. Kontexttheorie - Modalwörter - Konditionalsätze. Königstein, Taunus: Scriptor, 1978.

Kufner, Herbert L. The Grammatical Structures of English and German. A Contrastive Sketch. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1962.

Kürschner, Wilfried. Grammatisches Kompendium. Tübingen: A. Francke, 1989.

Lamprecht, Adolf. Grammatik der englischen Sprache. 6th ed. Cornelsen: Velhagen & Klasing, 1980.

Lang, Wilhelm. "Der Konjunktiv im Deutschen und sein Widerspiel." Der Deutschunterricht 3 (1961) : 26-55.

---. "Zur Geschichtlichen Deutung der Konjunktive." Der Deutschunterricht 1 (1963) : 67-76.

Leirbukt, Oddleif. "Nächstes Jahr wäre er 200 Jahre alt geworden. Über den Konjunktiv Plusquamperfekt in Hypothetischen Bedingungsgefügen mit Zukunftsbezug." Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik 19 (1991) : 158-93.

Levin, Samuel, R. "Langue and Parole in American Linguistics." Foundations of Language 1 (1965) : 83-94.

Licen, Marina. "Der Modus im Konzessivsatz." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 3 (1981) : 134-138.

Lötscher, Andreas. "Der Konjunktiv II bei Modalverben und die Semantik des Konjunktiv II." Sprachwissenschaft 16.3-4 (1991) : 334-64.

Mackensen, Lutz. Gutes Deutsch in Schrift und Rede. München: Mosaik, 1988.

Maclin, Alice. Reference Guide to English. A Handbook of English as a Second Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981.

Magnusson, Kerstin. Die Gliederung des Konjunktivs in Grammatiken der deutschen Sprache. Ed. Lars Hermodsson. Studia Germanistica Upsaliensia. Vol. 16. Uppsala, Sweden: Kerstin Magnusson, 1976.

Mauermann, Siegfried. "Die lebenswichtigen Möglichkeitsformen." Muttersprache 4 (1955) : 135-140.

Meinel, Hans. "Abstrahieren als eine Vorstufe zu philosophischer Erkenntnis." Der Deutschunterricht 1 (1963) : 63-66.

Mellbourn, Gert. "Die neue Duden-Grammatik." Moderna Språk 56.2 (1962) : 144-47.

Meinke, W. G. "The Use of the *als ob* (*als wenn*) Clauses." The German Quarterly 28 (1955) : 47-49.

Metschkowa-Atanassowa, Sdrawka. Temporale und konditionale "wenn" - Sätze. Untersuchung zu ihrer Abgrenzung und Typologie. Sprache der Gegenwart 58. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann-Bagel, 1983.

Moser, Hugo. Entwicklungstendenzen des heutigen Deutsch." Der Deutschunterricht 1 (1954) : 87-107.

Mühlner, W. and K. E. Sommerfeldt. "Der Konjunktiv als Mittel zum Ausdruck der Modalität im Deutschen und Russischen." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 6 (1974) : 360-69.

Neuhoff, Rolf. "Bemerkungen über den Konjunktiv." Der Deutschunterricht 1 (1959) : 68-87.

Nikitopoulos, Pantelis. "Vorgriffe auf eine Thematisierung der Repräsentativität eines Corpus." Deutsche Sprache 1 (1974) : 32-42.

Palmer, F. R. A Linguistic Study of the English Verb. Miami Linguistics Ser. 2. Miami: U of Miami P, 1968.

---. The English Verb. 2nd ed. London: Longman Group, 1987.

Panth, Eva. "Funktionelle Grammatik für den englischen Schüler." Deutsch als Fremdsprache 6 (1978) : 370-73.

Polenz, Peter von. Deutsche Satzsemantik. Grundbegriffe des Zwischen-den-Zeilen Lesens. Sammlung Göschen 2226. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.

Prager, Jutta. "Wesen und Ausdrucksformen des Modus im Neuhochdeutschen." Wirkendes Wort 5 (1962) : 274-81.

Quirk, Randolf, et al. A Grammar of Contemporary English. Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1972.

Röhrl, Emanuel. "Der Konjunktiv im heutigen Sprachgebrauch." Muttersprache 10 (1962) : 289-98.

Rutherford, William, E. Modern English. A Textbook for Foreign Students. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.

Sack. F. L. The Structure of English. Bern: A. Francke, 1954.

Schade, Günter. Einführung in die deutsche Sprache der Wissenschaften. Ein Lehrbuch für Ausländer. 9th ed. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1985.

Schaffer, Detlef. Untersuchungen zum Fiktions- und Tempusproblem der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Diss. U Wien, 1972. Wien: Notring, 1972.

Schmidt, Wilhelm. Grundfragen der deutschen Grammatik. Eine Einführung in die funktionale Sprachlehre. Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1973.

Schöne, Albrecht. "Zum Gebrauch des Konjunktivs bei Robert Musil." Euphorion 55 (1961) : 196-220.

Schrodt, Richard. System und Norm beim Konjunktiv in deutschen Inhaltssätzen. Wiener Arbeiten zur germanischen Altertumskunde und Philologie. Vol. 6. Wien: Karl M. Halosar, 1980.

Schulz, Dora and Heinz Griesbach. Deutsche Sprachlehre für Ausländer. Grundstufe in einem Band. 2nd ed. Ismaning: Max Hueber, 1971.

---. Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. 8th ed. München: Max Hueber, 1970.

Schwartz, Ulrike. Modus und Satzstruktur. Eine syntaktische Studie zum Modussystem im Deutschen. Skripten Linguistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft. Vol. 1. Kronberg, Taunus: Scriptor, 1973.

Schwarze, Christoph and Dieter Wunderlich, ed. Handbuch der Lexikologie. Königstein: Athenaüm, 1985.

Seibicke, Wilfried. "Wenn-Sätze." Muttersprache 9 (1964) : 260-271.

Settekorn, Wolfgang W. and Wolfgang H. Teubert. "Bemerkungen zum Konditionalsatz." Linguistische Studien II. Sprache der Gegenwart 22. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann, 1972.

Steger, Hugo. "Über Dokumentation und Analyse gesprochener Sprache." Zielsprache Deutsch 1 (1970) : 13-21.

Stein, Anneliese Sartori. Contrastive Grammar and Exercises English - German. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983.

Strutz, Henry. 501 German Verbs. New York: Barron's Educational Series, 1982.

Tamsen, Martin. "Über 'wenn - würde' im modernen Deutsch." Moderna Språk 52.4 (1958) : 373-85.

Thiel, Rudolf. "Über die grammatische Funktion des Verbs *werden*." Muttersprache 5 (1957) : 182-85.

---. "Zur Frage des Konjunktivs und des umschriebenen Verbs." Muttersprache 3 (1965) : 85-87.

Thomson, A. J. and A. V. Martinet. A Practical English Grammer. 4th. ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

Ulvestad, Bjarne. "The Structure of the German Quasi Clauses." The Germanic Review 3 (1956) : 200-214.

Wahrig, Gerhard. et. al. Deutsches Wörterbuch. München: Mosaik, 1989.

Weeren, Jan van. "Die Beziehung zwischen dem konjunktivischen Konditionalgefüge und der 'Realitätserfahrung' des Sprechenden im heutigen Deutsch." Neophilologus 59 (1975) : 62-67.

Windfuhr, Gernot. "Strukturelle Verschiebung: Konjunktiv Präsens und Imperativ im heutigen Deutsch." Linguistics 36 (1967) : 84-99.